# THEOLOGY

## A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY S. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

Property of CBDP

Vol. XXXIV. JANUARY, 1937 No. 199

## CONTENTS

Please return to Graduate Theological Union Library

EDITORIAL

ARTICLES

Christ in Nineteenth-Century Thought - - E. G. Selwyn, D.D.
Validity : Name and Thing - - - - - B. J. Kidd, D.D.
Almsgiving in the Church of England - - - Charles Smyth.

MISCELLANEA

Birth Control - - - - - - - - - E. Lyttelton, D.D.
The Farnham Conference.

Correspondence

English Orders - - - - - - - - Humphry Beevor. C. C. J. Webb. C. B. Moss.

REVIEWS

God in Patristic Thought (G. L. Prestige) - - F. J. Badcock, D.D.
Charles Lindley, Viscount Halifax (J. G. Lockhart) S. C. Carpenter.
The Roman Primacy to A.D. 461 (B. J. Kidd) - Bishop Frere.
The History of the York School of Glass-Painting (J. A. Knowles) - - - - - - - - Christopher Woodforde.

NOTICES

LONDON — Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

S.P.C.K. HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1s. net per copy; 12s. net per annum, post free.

v. 34-35
1937


## THE PAULINE EPISTLES AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS IN THEIR HISTORICAL SETTING

By the REV. F. J. BADCOCK, D.D., Fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. **8s. 6d.**

A brilliant study of New Testament problems, giving a mass of evidence in support of a re-dating of St. Paul's Epistles, in the following order: Thessalonians; Philippians—Colossians—Philemon; I Corinthians; Titus; 2 Corinthians; Romans; I and 2 Timothy; Ephesians. No student of the Bible should miss this conservative-revolutionary book.

With a map

## THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST IN THE LIGHT OF OUR PRESENT-DAY KNOWLEDGE

By the REV. JOHN H. BEST, B.Sc. **6s.**

It is the writer's belief that the old Rationalism, which ruled out miracles as *a priori* impossible, has become out of date owing to the progress of science, especially in the realm of physics. He has a scientific equipment rare among the clergy and is able to make a valuable contribution to the problem.

## A STUDY OF BOSSUET

By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. **7s. 6d.**

Bossuet, perhaps the greatest theologian of the French Church, is of living interest to-day as the exponent of Gallicanism. He was intimately acquainted with the affairs of the Church of England, and in his controversy with Leibniz dealt with the problems which must still be discussed before the Reunion of Christendom can take place. Dr. Sparrow Simpson in the present volume summarises Bossuet's teaching.

*(Published for the Church Historical Society)*

## GOD AND THE MODERN MIND

By HUBERT S. BOX, B.D., Ph.D.

With a Foreword by A. E. TAYLOR, M.A., D.Litt. **10s.**

This Book is a sequel to *The World and God*. It deals with representative figures of modern philosophy, both learned and popular, as far as possible letting them speak for themselves, and judging them in the main by the standards set by St. Thomas Aquinas.

---

**SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE**

**Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2**

*And of all Booksellers* *Lists post free*

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIV JANUARY, 1937 No. 199

## EDITORIAL

Amid the strange and sad events that came to pass among us in the first ten days of December two reassuring things emerged. Throughout this country and the Dominions belief in a lofty ideal of marriage and attachment to the Throne as a centre of spiritual unity were able to withstand the shock that they received. But the shock and, as the Bishop of Coventry put it, the humiliation for us all were very great. It seems impossible to doubt that much damage has been done. Many, especially among the young, were carried away by well-intended but ill-considered sentiment. A few thought to take advantage of the distress for party purposes. And there were those who scoffed at what they called the survival of obsolete tabus. But what demoralizes some will fortify others and clarify their judgment. The rank and file stood fast. They were sorrowful, patient, charitable, resolute. They were convinced that the honour of the Throne is of more moment than the happiness or the continuance in kingship of its occupant. They were convinced that the duty of the First Citizen of the Empire is to put the Empire first. They even felt dumbly, though most found no words for it, that the Lord's Anointed should put his trust in the Lord, and then "in the mercy of the most Highest he shall not miscarry."

---

These were the thoughts of English people during the dark uncertain days. At last the tension broke. The King, with that loyalty to the Constitution which has never failed him, and with the royal dignity which might in happier circumstances have carried him to great heights of achievement, chose to lay aside the burden to which he found himself unequal. It was an immense renunciation, the like of which has not been seen in our time or in any other. There was in it power and generosity, which must be honoured. But power and generosity are given among men to be used aright. What we have seen is a tragedy,



337952

the tragedy of one who refuses, for personal reasons, a divine vocation. The Church is sad for this. Failure is always saddening, especially in high place. Yet when the signs of coming failure can be clearly and certainly discerned, the true remedy is the painful knife. The Church shares with the State anxiety lest the dislocation consequent upon a forced, sudden change of monarchy should prove dangerous. Yet with all that, the Church is relieved and happy at the passing of a scandal which would have vitiated the Coronation, secularized its sacredness, and robbed city and village of the simple happiness with which they were prepared to greet it. There was a danger lest in an atmosphere of unwilling but law-driven inconsistency the Establishment, and not the Establishment only, might have gone down into the abyss. Now, looking to the future, we say of the new King:

> May he defend our laws,
> And ever give us cause
> To sing with heart and voice—
> God save the King.

For ourselves we may remember that the Interpreter said to Christian: "Hast thou considered these things?" Christian replied, "Yes, and they put me in hope and fear." Let there be no judging, in the sense of distributing blame. But let there be judging in the sense of self-examination and a renewal of the hold on the real values. One of the results of the removing of those things which are shaken is that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. The prayer put by the Church into the mouth of those who watch by a dying bed is: "Teach us who survive, in this and other like daily spectacles of mortality, to see how frail and uncertain our own condition is."

---

"Behold I make all things new." The word is *Kainos* (fresh), not *neos* (recent). The distinction between the two words which was made so confidently by the older scholars has not been wholly annihilated by the papyrus evidence. It is, like St. Paul, "cast down but not destroyed." The almost wholly consistent usage of the New Testament (Heb. xii. 24 is perhaps the sole exception) can hardly be non-significant. "I make all things new" does not mean "I make all things modern." It means "I renew all things."

---

Perhaps there was never a time when things more urgently needed to be renewed. It is manifest that reliance on the old things is useless. When Samson during the night was robbed of the seven locks of hair in which his strength resided, he

awoke from sleep and said, "I will go out as at other times, and shake myself." As a toilet it is rudimentary, but the contrast between it and the careful washing, shaving, and dressing of the civilized modern man is not only a contrast in mere social habit. The Samson method is symbolic of the way in which a secular-minded person, or a secular-minded generation, prepares to meet a new day. I will pull myself together, he says; I will summon up my natural resources. I will shake myself, in the hope that the sight of my muscular development will terrify my enemies. I will shake myself, in the hope that the physical exercise will improve my circulation and save me from cold feet. I will shake myself, in the hope that the mere movement will create a pleasant breeze in which I shall be able to draw salubrious breath. In a word, I will take my sins on my own back, and save myself.

---

It is the note of arrogance and self-confidence which is always to be condemned. What is the alternative? A humble believer can be just as glad about the daylight as anybody else, and as for shaking himself, in the figurative sense of pulling himself together, it is a thing which he often does. But he will not count on that for victory. He will also mean to cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light. If there were no such possibility, the outlook for 1937 would be dark indeed. At any moment the hysterical nationalism of some intemperate leader, or the growing tension between two opposed forms of government in Europe, which has already in one country led to barbarous fighting, or even a mistake arising out of the circumstances of an attempted naval blockade, might precipitate a tragedy. And in such tragedy not merely most of what we value in the visible world, but vast numbers of human beings, perhaps a quarter, perhaps a third of the population of many European nations, would perish, or be blinded, maimed, or driven to insanity. And we are being drawn—on the secular basis on which, though it is not the only basis, we have to live—to guard against the danger in ways which themselves confess the likelihood of war, and perhaps even sign to it to approach. If the only policy available were that of Samson, the future would be dark.

---

But by the mercy of God there is the armour of light. Will it keep off the danger? To a point it will even do that. For this armour, though it is impalpable and not such as will save a martyr's life, nevertheless illuminates and exhilarates the souls of both actual martyrs and such as are willing to be confessors.

And the sun's rays, reflected from it, are infectious. They reach the souls of others. If the Christian people can have the gentle strength, the generous humility, the high-minded and self-forgetful courage and love of justice that are among the fruits of the Spirit, they will shine as lights in the world. They will be carriers, not of disease but of health, and will infect others with the wholesome epidemic of the Christian way of life. That way recovery lies. That would postpone, would even, if there were enough of it, prevent the coming of the evil day.

---

But there is one thing that the armour of light will not do. It will not bring prosperity or even security. These things are desirable, and we may work for them, but the believer has no claim on God for them. He may not say "I am deserving, and it is not fair that this sadness, this poverty, or this fear of losing all my savings or even my life in another European war, should come to me." There is no guarantee, even of safety. That was an Old Testament superstition. The Psalmist says (xxxvii. 25): "I have been young, and am now old: and yet saw I never the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging their bread." The only possible comment on this is that his experience must have been unusual, because it is not borne out by facts. Another Psalmist (cxii. 7) takes a truer view. Speaking of the good man, he says that he "will not be afraid for any evil tidings: for his heart standeth fast, and he believeth in the Lord."

---

Belief in the Lord carries with it belief in the things which are permanent, the things which are eternal. This is a fair-sounding platitude. Let us put it to the test of an actual example. A priest-writer in *Christianity and the Social Revolution* finds blasphemy in a Collect in the Revised Prayer Book. He says (p. 64): "When we consider how our Empire has been obtained—by fraud, trickery, and violence—the unctuous assumption that God has bestowed it upon His chosen Englishmen is almost British-Israelite in its pharisaic naïveté." This, however, relates to the past. Most of us, perhaps also the writer quoted, would agree that the British commitments all over the world are much more of a duty than a privilege, and we are painfully learning the spirit of world-service. Now what about the future? This much is surely true. If it shall please God to continue the people of our race in a place of responsibility as one of the greater nations of the world, we must accept that with sober thankfulness. If it shall please God to remedy our pride with the sharp medicine of adversity, we

must accept the better understanding of life's meaning which that discipline would bring. For truth and justice are the best things of all. The armour of light is not made of gold. Nor is it made of finely-tempered, shot-resisting steel. It is made of a precious, a divine substance which was planted in the world at Bethlehem. It matured, and was exhibited to the astonished eyes of men in Galilee. It was released and made available for use on the Hill of Calvary, and in the April garden of Joseph of Arimathæa, and amid the wind and fire of Pentecost. And ever since it has been at our disposal, freely, every day.

---

This is the secret of Christmas, which stands so happily just behind the New Year. The philanthropic exhortations which are so common at Christmas-tide to remember "the season of peace and good will," often go no deeper than the level of transient sentiment, and so fail of their appeal, because they neglect the true motive. The true motive could have been ascertained by a glance at the New Testament. The angels of the Nativity are wiser than the discreet philanthropist. Angels are doubtless innocent, but they are not so simple as to suppose that you can suddenly turn war and hatred into peace and good will without a motive. And having a motive, they do not fail to utter it. Accordingly, they begin with *Gloria in excelsis Deo.* Why? Because at Bethlehem there was a divine reinforcement which "came down from heaven." Restatements of Christianity which forget to state this are statements of something other than the Gospel. It may be very nice, and it is certainly much easier to believe than the Gospel. But it is not only other than what the New Testament teaches; it does not harmonize with the situation revealed by the historical evidence of the New Testament. As Canon Mozley says in his admirable book, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation* (The Christian Challenge Series, Unicorn Press, 3s. 6d.), if our Lord had been at the most a deified man, "the New Testament would never have come to be written in the way in which it is written. The strain on a monotheistic faith would have been too great; the tension between devotion to the one and true God and devotion equally ardent and grateful to one separated from that God by the impassable width of the gulf dividing humanity from deity could not have been repressed. As it is, there is the devotion, and complete lack of tension." It is in the spirit of that faith that we must face the New Year, and the Epiphany adventure that lies beyond it. "Some put their trust in chariots and some in horses: but we will remember the Name of the Lord our God."

---

The three letters which we publish this month on English Orders represent together a very powerful position. The fact that they do not all approach the question from the same point of view strengthens the cumulative effect of what they urge. Apart from mere Protestantism—in the non-historical, popular sense of the term—the Anglican case is in part an affirmation (with evidence) that the Church of England is a true part of the Catholic Church, and in part an affirmation (again with evidence) that the Church of England has something which the Roman Church has not. In this connection we are glad to announce that a forthcoming number of THEOLOGY will contain an article by Dr. Sparrow Simpson on the meaning of the word "Protestant" in connection with the Coronation.

---

The Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations reports that many of the Council's foreign correspondents have expressed a desire to secure copies of THEOLOGY. Offers accompanied by the name and address of the sender and the name of the Church for which they have a preference should be sent to—The Hon. General Secretary, Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, 535, Grand Buildings, Trafalgar Square, London, W.C. 2, and should be marked "Periodicals Bureau."

# CHRIST IN THE THOUGHT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY*

THE principal contributions to the thought of the nineteenth century about Christ came from two countries, England and Germany. I speak of England rather than of the British Isles because, although important work on the doctrine of Christ was done during the century in Scotland, and perhaps still more in Ireland, the main interest of theologians in these two countries was concerned more especially with ecclesiastical problems and questions of Biblical scholarship. On the Continent the name of Renan arises to remind us that France also made its contribution. But Renan's star is a lonely one, and his *Vie de Jésus*, celebrated as a work of literature, has not in any other sense stood the test of time. As Schweitzer has said, it is " the art of the wax image "; and wax images look tawdry after a while. In England and in Germany, on the other hand, we have distinct and persistent traditions of thought which exercised throughout the century a strong influence on the spiritual life of the two countries. Nor were they without influence on one another, to the extent at least that the work of the Liberal Protestant School in Germany always found a ready echo in one section of religious thought in this country.

I propose to take the German story first, and to make it hang upon the work of three men in particular, Schleiermacher, Strauss, and Harnack. Schleiermacher's first great work, the *Reden über die Religion*, appeared in 1799; Harnack's *What is Christianity?* comprises sixteen lectures delivered in the University of Berlin during the winter of 1899-1900. Strauss' first *Life of Jesus* appeared in 1835, and his second, which was a much less striking work, in 1864. The work of these three men thus spans the whole of the century.

By common consent Schleiermacher is one of the outstanding figures in the religious thought of Europe since the Reformation; some would say that his influence is comparable with Luther's. Perhaps the chief reason for this is that he brought back into a Protestantism which had been ossified by the mental atmosphere of the eighteenth century the warmth and fervour of personal religion. He was at once the Wesley and the Coleridge of Germany. Grounding everything on the sense of filial dependance upon God, which was the meaning that he gave to faith, he found this filial dependance supremely ex-

* The Gore Memorial Lecture delivered at Westminster Abbey on Friday, November 27, 1936.

emplified in Christ. Deeply convinced of the universality of sin and of man's fallen state, Schleiermacher insisted that man could not save himself, and therefore needed Redemption from above. This Redemption was given to men by Christ, in whom the ideal and the historical were united, and through whose humanity the principle of the divine life was implanted in the Church. The proof of Christianity, he said, lies in the regenerated lives of those to whom Christ imparts, through faith, His own nature. True Christian piety is thus based on the relationship of the individual believer to God in Christ, and to other believers in the Church.

Criticism of Schleiermacher's teaching has proceeded mainly from two quarters. From the philosophical and dogmatic side his teaching of the sense of dependance as the ground of faith, and the only form in which man can receive the Absolute, left religion with only a subjective basis. Not only was human freedom endangered, but, as Mansel pointed out, owing to the fact that in this theory God was contemplated "in the character of an *object of infinite magnitude*," "the feeling of absolute dependance is, in fact, that of the annihilation of our personal existence in the Infinite Being of the Universe."* And a further result was to leave man's faith unrelated to his knowledge. As Martensen said, "the Christ of Schleiermacher's system was the Head of the Church but not the Head of the whole of creation"; there is no summing-up of all things in Him; no place is left for the cosmical Christ of St. Paul's later Epistles or of the Prologue to St. John.

Criticism equally serious came from the side of history. Schleiermacher's *Life of Jesus* was not published until 1864, but the materials on which it was based (for it was published long after his death) were given as lectures in 1832. And it is strongly apriorist. "Schleiermacher," says Schweitzer, "is not in search of the historical Jesus but of the Jesus Christ of his own system of theology; that is to say, of the historic figure which seems to him appropriate to the self-consciousness of the Redeemer as he represents it. For him the empirical has simply no existence." Thus he prefers the fourth Gospel to the other three as being more free from any flavour of Docetism on the one hand, or of Ebionism on the other, and as representing the filial consciousness of Jesus in the clearest outline. His view of the Gospel miracles is characteristic. One of his reasons for his preference for the fourth Gospel is that it records fewer miracles than the others; he fails to see, as Strauss pointed out, that, though the Johannine miracles are fewer, their miraculous character is far more pronounced. A miracu-

* Bampton Lectures, Lecture IV.

lous story is for Schleiermacher something to be either toned down until it admits of a natural explanation, or else abandoned as unhistorical. Thus with regard to the Resurrection he thinks it immaterial to Faith whether we believe that Christ really rose from the dead or that His death was only a trance from which He was reanimated; but he himself on *a priori* rationalistic grounds holds the latter view.

These weaknesses in Schleiermacher's historical armour were fully exploited in the middle of the century by David Friedrich Strauss. Strauss was a Hegelian, and brought the Hegelian dialectic to bear on the historical criticism of the Gospels. Finding the two schools of Supernaturalism (or, as we might say, Orthodoxy) and Rationalism opposed to one another, Strauss maintained that the opposition could only be reconciled by the use of a third category, which he called Myth. In making this claim, Strauss set the problem of Christian origins in a new context, that of Comparative Religion; and for two generations this scent was keenly followed. The Myth which was at work in the primitive Christian community represented, he said, the historical realization of the idea of God-manhood. That was the central doctrine of Christianity—not an Incarnation of God in one Man, Jesus, but the Incarnation of God in all men through their acceptance of the principle revealed in Jesus. From this point of view the degree of perfection to which the idea was realized in the historical personality of Jesus is of no consequence; what matters is that from the history we should learn the idea. Standing on this ground, Strauss claims to be emancipated both from the checks of Orthodoxy and from the tedious obligations of Rationalism; of the two, he objects more to the latter. The nature of Myth once discerned, its presence in the Gospel stories can be detected without difficulty. Thus, the narratives of the events, prior to our Lord's baptism, are Myth; so, too, is the story of the Temptation; and so also the recognition of His Messiahship by the devils. Under the title of "Sea-stories and Fish-stories" he dismisses all the nature miracles; the narrative of the Transfiguration is due to the desire that Christ should not be outdone by Moses, whose face shined in God's presence. All the Resurrection narratives are mythical: Christ's death was only a trance from which He was reanimated. On the other hand, much of the eschatological element in Christ's teaching must be regarded as authentic and as representing an important element in His mind and outlook. So for the Gospel history he leaves us with a parable—"truth embodied in a tale."

It is not surprising that Strauss' work created a profound stir, in this country no less than in Germany. But just as when

a stone is thrown into a pond the ripples grow smaller in height as their distance from the centre increases, so Strauss' startling theories were eventually to be levelled down. He himself, indeed, in his second *Life of Jesus*, published in 1864, did much of the levelling, and, as Schweitzer says, " eliminated eschatology, and instead of the historical Jesus portrayed the Jesus of Liberal Protestantism." The truth is that Strauss was working with inadequate critical tools. He did grasp, though on *a priori* rather than on scientific grounds, that the Synoptic Gospels were to be preferred to the fourth as historical sources; but among the Synoptists he reckoned St. Matthew and St. Luke to be older than St. Mark. St. Mark seemed to him to be an epitomizer of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and to represent some of the tendencies which he most disliked in the Rationalists of his own day. A noteworthy feature of Strauss' treatment of the Synoptic Gospels is the way in which he stumbles at the parables, most of which he believed to be not authentic in their present form. Here Strauss was perhaps a better historian than he knew; for later criticism, though it does not endorse Strauss' disbelief in the genuineness of the parables, does certainly see in them elements which accord ill with Strauss' portrait of Jesus as a whole.

Strauss' second *Life of Jesus* introduces us, as I have said, to that Liberal Protestant view of our Lord which was to hold the field in Germany up to the end of the century. This view may be briefly outlined as follows: Jesus was a teacher sent from God to reveal the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. For this purpose He was endowed with a uniquely vivid consciousness of His filial relation to the Father, and with a unique sympathy with men and women of every kind. That He worked some miracles need not be denied, seeing that miracles of healing are met with in our own day; but the nature miracles, the birth-narratives, and the story of the Resurrection are due to the impression made by His personality, and are not historically credible. If He called Himself the Son of God it was because He was conscious of knowing God; and if He claimed to be the Messiah, it was because He believed that all the spiritual hopes and aspirations of His nation had found their fulfilment in Him. Yet we must not suppose that He ever intended to be more than the bearer of God's Message. He stands in the line of the prophets, distinct from them only in the greater scope of His message and in the closer conformity of His life with it. What the early Church did was to make the fatal mistake of making Christ Himself the Gospel. There were, no doubt, difficult things in the authentic teaching of Jesus; but these had been magnified in the interests of Christology by the

Evangelists; and a sound criticism, based on the Marcan hypothesis now generally accepted, was able to make the true Jesus of history stand out before us in all His primitive simplicity.

The immense impression which Harnack's *What is Christianity?* which is the classical expression of the Liberal Protestant view, made upon men at the time of its appearance seems to us today somewhat strange. There is much in it which is attractive, much which focusses thoughts and images which have been dear to us in the works of other writers of the last century, such as Sir John Seeley and Dr. Phillips Brooks. But the picture which it gives, as a whole, of our Lord and of His teaching, seems to us today almost incredibly jejune. In the first place this doctrine has no room for the Cross; and today it is the Gospel of the Cross that we crave for. It smacks of that complacent atmosphere of the end of the nineteenth century which we of today seem to look back to from afar, sometimes with envy, but more often, perhaps, with a smile; for we believe that the crisis of human affairs in which we live reflects more faithfully than those more settled days the true crisis or judgment of God before which mankind is always standing. There is no Gospel for us except in a Christ crucified and risen; and the words of Jesus which we love and seek are the words of the crucified and risen Lord.

And again, the Liberal Protestant picture does not square with the facts. Indeed, its death-knell was close at hand. When Schweitzer published, early in the present century, his epoch-making work, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, he cut away the very foundations on which the Liberal Protestant view had rested. He shewed how, for the past century and a half, there had been one element in the teaching of Christ which was too stubbornly imbedded in the documentary sources to be disregarded—I mean, the element of eschatology. Schweitzer, perhaps, pressed eschatology too far; the Jesus of history is not perhaps quite the "stranger" and the "enigma" that Schweitzer presents. But the scientific study of the Gospels will never allow us to return to any view of them in which Christology is not central, not merely to the minds of the Evangelists but to the mind of the Lord Himself.

I turn now from Germany to England. At the outset we may observe two general features of English theological thought in the nineteenth century which distinguish it sharply from that of Germany. The first lies in the qualifications of the men engaged in it. Rarely have these been seen in such effective combination. In each generation the great Christian teachers and thinkers are men who add to the highest academic

attainments at Oxford and Cambridge, showing themselves in wide and accurate linguistic knowledge and in massive classical and Biblical learning, the practical interests and sympathies which come from long pastoral experience and close contact with the social needs and movements of the day. Clergy hold many of the highest posts in the Universities and Public Schools, and adorn them by solid contributions to scholarship and thought; and, conversely, parochial cures are occupied by men who are in the first rank as historians, scientists, and divines. The result is a certain wholeness about religious thought in England which gives it a special title to represent the universal Gospel of Christ. There is nothing "donnish" in it; it is singularly free from fanciful theories and speculations. What it lacks in the logical precision of theory it makes up for in the deeper consistency which comes from the application of Christianity to life.

The second notable feature of English theology in this period is its freedom and scope. German theology during this century, and especially the Liberal Protestantism of the last half of it, bears the constant mark of conscious or unconscious reaction from the Catholicism of the Roman Church. But in this country the Roman Church is only a minority body; and even when Newman's secession made the Roman controversy a live issue for a time, it left little or no mark upon English theology as a whole. English divines give no impression, as the Germans so often do, of having to give reasons for not embracing the Catholic faith. For the Catholic faith is exactly what they are conscious of having been brought up in and what they affirm—a faith, indeed, all the more truly Catholic because it is not encased in the strait-waistcoat of the Latin system. They think and write as men whose feet are set in a large room.

Here, too, as in the case of Germany, I propose to hang what I have to say round three names—those of Maurice, Westcott, and Gore—two of them, it may be observed, at one time Canons of this Abbey Church. The fact that there may be some here who perhaps heard Westcott, as well as Gore, preach from this pulpit, justifies me perhaps in drawing attention, especially this afternoon, to Maurice. But it is not the only reason. For both Westcott and Gore, together with those who worked in close collaboration with them, never ceased to testify to the debt which they owed to Maurice; and there is scarcely a theologian today in England who does not bear the same testimony.

One of Maurice's deepest convictions was of the objectivity of the Word of God. He found that Word recorded in Scripture,

revealed in history, and embodied in Christ. The Creed was its summary; the Church with its experience of the divine life within it, its certificate; and the Sacraments its centre of cohesion. The divine order expressed in the phrase "The Kingdom of God" was not something foreign to the world which Christianity sought to impose upon it; but is the true and original constitution of things, which was revealed and made possible for man's appropriation in Christ.

The Christ of Maurice's faith was thus the cosmical Christ, the Head of all things and not only of the Church. The roots of Maurice's Christology are to be traced, in the first instance, I think, to William Law. The following passage from the eighteenth-century divine might almost have been written by Maurice:

"Therefore, though Jesus Christ is the one only Saviour of all that can anywhere, or at any time, be saved, yet there is no partiality in God; because this same Jesus Christ, who came in human flesh to the Jews in a certain age, was that same Saviour who was given to Adam when all mankind were in his loins; and who, through all ages, and in all countries, from the first patriarch to the end of the world, is the common Saviour, as He is the common Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, and that principle of life both in Jews and heathens by which they had any relation to God, or any power, or right, or ability to call Him Father. When, therefore, you look upon the Gospel as narrowing the way of salvation or limiting it to those who only know and believe in Jesus Christ since His appearance in the flesh, you mistake the whole nature of the Christian redemption."

To these words, which represent his view of the Incarnation, we may add some of Maurice's own words on the subject of the Atonement:

"Every year and day convinces me that our preaching will be good for nothing if the main subject of it is not the atonement of God with man in Christ; if we may not proclaim His sacrifice as a finished work; if we may not ground all our sacrifices upon it; if we stop short of the Eucharistic proclamation that God of His tender mercy hath given us His Son to be a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Any notions, theories, practices which interfere with the fullness of this Gospel deprive men, it seems to me, of a blessing which has been bestowed upon them and to which they have a right—deprive them of the only effectual foundation for social and individual reformation."

Such was the kernel of Maurice's faith, which was, and is, the faith of the Catholic Church. And we can see how it determined his attitude to two of the pressing problems of his day —the problem of historical criticism and the problem of social righteousness.

In regard to historical criticism Maurice insisted that it

should be perfectly free. There was no reason why the same methods of scientific enquiry which had been applied by Wolff, by Niebuhr, and by Arnold to the records of classical antiquity should not be applied to the Scriptures: human reason was God's gift and was not to be distrusted in its proper sphere. But he claimed, likewise, that this scientific enquiry must have regard to the meaning of the Scriptures as a whole; it must wrest their meaning from them, not impose its own theories upon them; nor must it interpret one section of the documents in such a way as to make them inconsistent with the whole. It was on these lines that he met the storm raised by Strauss' first *Life of Jesus*. He was vigorously attacked from within the Church and his ideas regarded as dangerously liberal. But his hold upon the central truths of Christianity and his grasp of the true meaning of theology were such that he determined the attitude which English theology would take towards criticism for the remainder of the century.

And events have justified him up to the hilt. Wave after wave of theory has come from the advanced critical schools in this country and in Germany, and hurled itself in vain upon the lighthouse of the Catholic faith. Strauss' theory of the influence of Myth on the Gospels led to a whole series of attempts to account for their miraculous elements through the infiltration of ideas derived from Chaldæan astrology, Persian cosmology, or the Mystery Religions of the Hellenistic world. The Liberal Protestant school pursued the methods of literary criticism until Schmiedel reached the astonishing conclusion that the unquestionably authentic sayings of Jesus numbered only eleven. The Tübingen School found in a supposed conflict between St. Peter and St. Paul the clue to the New Testament, and assigned to this faction or to that various features of the Synoptic narrative. By the end of the century it was fashionable to distinguish between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, as though there could be no Jesus Christ who was the same yesterday, today, and for ever. All these waves of critical theory reached their crest, broke upon the lighthouse rock and ebbed away. And they ebbed away, not because they were suppressed by authority, but because their intrinsic weakness was exposed by the very methods of enquiry which had been held to justify their advance.

That was one justification of Maurice's position: but it was not the only one. Each wave left something on the rocks, not merely flotsam and jetsam, but something of value which the Church could assimilate and use. The Church is not only the *Ecclesia docens* but also the *Ecclesia discens*; and there are few sides of our understanding of Christ's life and Person which

have not been enriched in one way or another by the work even of the extremer forms of criticism.

The second great feature of Maurice's theology is its application to the problems of society. It has often been observed that whereas on the Continent the Social Movement has been mainly anti-Christian and anti-clerical, no such general statement would be true of this country. The fact is all the more remarkable seeing that it synchronizes with the determined opposition to all form of Liberalism, social as well as intellectual, in the Roman Church which reached its climax in the dogma of Papal Infallibility in 1870. For this contrast we have mainly to thank the Christian Socialism of Maurice and his friends. And it was a doctrine which issued directly from his Christology. In the Incarnation God had taken the whole of humanity to Himself, so that by union with Christ all men might come to know God as their Father and themselves as brethren. No human needs, therefore, were outside the scope of the Divine mercy, no human passions beyond the pale of redemption, no human ideals unable to be hallowed by His Name. In the strength of this faith, which blinked nothing of the stern realities of sin and pain, Maurice was able to claim the whole social order for Christ, and to press upon the Church and world alike the relevance of the principles of the Kingdom of God.

In a letter to Maurice, written in 1849, Hort speaks of "your willingness to assist us again and again in discerning the eternal order among all the confusions that beset us." The phrase sums up in a sentence the debt which both Westcott and Hort felt themselves to owe to Maurice. How each of them repaid that debt by developing his work would make a valuable study in itself. I have chosen today to speak of Westcott rather than of Hort, not because I regard him as a profounder thinker but because his thought moved along certain lines which were specially characteristic of the last half of the Victorian Age. These lines may be illustrated from Westcott's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,* a work published while he was a Canon of Westminster: "The revelation in Christ the Son is perfect in both substance and in form. The Incarnation and Ascension include absolutely all that is wrought out slowly, and appropriated little by little, in the experience of later life. . . The Incarnation, in other words, is the central point of all Life. . . . All that we can learn of the constitution of man, of the constitution of nature, of the 'laws' of history must, from the nature of the case, illustrate its meaning for us." In a series of sermons preached from this pulpit about the same time, entitled *Christus Consummator,* Westcott developed this theme and shewed how Christ was the Crown and Centre

of man's manifold activities and ideals, social, intellectual, and æsthetic.

In the work of Westcott we find a combination of Hellenism and Christianity which recalls the great School of Alexandria in the early centuries. He was a Christian Platonist in the widest sense of the term. "Christ, the Glory of all civilization," may be taken as the motto of his theology. It was essentially a world-affirming doctrine. Progress and civilization were terms which at that time seemed to bear no uncertain meaning, because it seemed possible to see them embodied in so many ways on every side. The deeper reflections on life which Christianity prompted could not fail to find in them elements of insufficiency; but it was just this insufficiency that the Gospel was able to make good with its faith in Christ taking humanity into Himself. The Incarnation turned Christian Platonism into Christian optimism.

Nowhere is this Christian optimism, that is based on faith in the Incarnation, more apparent than in the work of the two great poets of this age—Robert Browning and Alfred, Lord Tennyson. In Tennyson it takes, for the most part, a mystical form, in Browning a dogmatic. Take for example the Prologue to "In Memoriam":

> "Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be:
> They are but broken lights of thee,
> And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Or the rhapsody of the bells:

> "Ring out old shapes of foul disease;
> Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
> Ring out the thousand wars of old,
> Ring in the thousand years of peace.
>
> "Ring in the valiant man and free,
> The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
> Ring out the darkness of the land,
> Ring in the Christ that is to be."

And then the closing lines, with their faith in—

> "That God, which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

And this doctrine can be illustrated abundantly from Browning. Yet Browning has a deeper note. He thinks of Christianity as:

> "The faith that launched point-blank her dart
> At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,
> The Corruption of Man's Heart."

So in one of the noblest expressions of his faith we find the Cross linked closely with the Incarnation:

> "The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
> So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
> So, through the thunder, comes a human voice
> Saying, 'O heart I made, a heart beats here!
> Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
> Thou hast no power nor mayst conceive of mine,
> But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
> And thou must love me who have died for thee!'
> The madman saith He said so: it is strange."

It is this deeper note which we find so marked in the work of Westcott's pupil and eventual successor in this pulpit, Charles Gore. Circumstances compelled Gore, while still a young man, to come to grips with some of the technical theological problems involved in the Catholic doctrine of Christ's Person; and the solution which he found for these involved him in a difference of opinion with Canon Liddon which both men took deeply to heart. Liddon's Bampton Lectures had been a magnificent exposition and defence of the Divinity of our Lord. Writing at a time when the Liberal Protestant portrait of the life of Christ was passing from Germany to this country, he pointed out that it was inconsistent with the evidence provided by the Gospels: and confronting the critics with the dilemma *Aut Deus aut homo non bonus*, he shewed the Catholic faith in Christ's Divinity to have at any rate far better historical credentials than its alternative. But the battle was not over. Gore, editing *Lux Mundi* a generation later, had to face the assured results of Old Testament criticism; and among these was the fact that certain passages in the Old Testament could not now be assigned to the authorship which had been given to them even on our Lord's own lips in the New. Had we then to admit that our Lord was not infallible? Gore faced and met this problem by an interpretation of our Lord's human nature and its conditions which involved a revival of the doctrine known as the *Kenosis*. According to this theory the self-emptying of the Eternal Son of God involved in the Incarnation implied that omniscience could not be predicated of our Lord's human consciousness; and belief in his Divinity did not mean that we should expect Him to have knowledge of questions of literary criticism which were impossible to men of his time. Gore's future teaching and influence owe more perhaps than is commonly recognized to his breach on this point with Liddon. For it gave him a freedom of interpretation in regard to the Gospels, and a stimulus to study further the field of our Lord's humanity, which were productive of some of his finest works. I need only mention his lectures on *The Sermon on the Mount*, and that beautiful little book of his in

the Home University Library, *Jesus of Nazareth*. What Gore did, in fact, was to effect a real synthesis between the Catholic faith in the Incarnation and the new understanding of the Jesus of history which the discerning use of critical method had made possible.

And, finally, Gore's theology is marked at every point by the Cross. There is little formal discussion of the Atonement in his writings and he is, for the most part, content to represent the death of Christ as an act of reparation for sin made on behalf of mankind by Him who was both Son of God and Son of Man. But there runs through his writings, and indeed through his life, evidence of his having entered deeply into the mystery of the Cross. His friend and collaborator in *Lux Mundi*, Dr. Moberly, had written a large treatise on the Atonement representing Christ as the great Penitent on behalf of the human race. I do not recall any explicit endorsement of this conception by Bishop Gore; and yet it seems to me to have deeply influenced his thought. He was himself one of the great penitents of his generation, cherishing no illusions as to the depth of human misery and sin from which Christ came to redeem men. In the literature of the period his outlook on life has many affinities with that of the great Russian novelist, Dostoievski. It may be described (to use a phrase of Father Tyrrell's) as a "proximate pessimism" combined with an "ultimate optimism." The title of the Community which he founded, The Community of the Resurrection, leaves no doubt as to the "ultimate optimism": but the whole tenor of his teaching equally leaves no doubt as to his "proximate pessimism." The Eternal Son of God was also the Lamb of God, the Crucified.

And there we must bring our story to its close. The developments in England and Germany run parallel throughout the century; and the tension which they reveal between the Factual and the Doctrinal elements in religion remains unresolved at the end. Yet both are opening a way to the place where its resolution is to be found. On the critical side, the main conclusions of the documentary analysis of the Scriptures have not been seriously altered since the nineteenth century closed; and German theology has turned itself increasingly in our generation to the study of the Gospel itself as the Word of God, with its tidings of Redemption through the Cross of Christ. In England, likewise, the note of pessimism and the need of Redemption, which were coming to the fore in Bishop Gore's teaching, has increasingly led Christian thought to the Cross. The events of the present century have seemed each year to drive the message home. The churches which St. Paul

planted and St. John watered in Asia Minor have ceased to exist; in Russia the life of the Church has become a continual martyrdom; nearer home, rival political creeds share a common faith in Force as the best instrument of human progress—a faith that challenges the first principles of the Kingdom of God. In the crucible of these events there is being formed a Liberal Catholicism which has the Cross of Christ as its centre. It is Catholic because it recognizes that nothing less than the universal Faith and Church and Sacraments of Christendom can stand today amid the storms; it is Liberal because it recognizes that not every factual happening which has been part of the Christian tradition is equally indispensable to the historical core or nucleus of Christ's religion; and it has the Cross at its heart, because it knows that only out of much tribulation and through death and resurrection can we enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

E. G. Selwyn.

## VALIDITY: NAME AND THING

In a weighty but not yet authoritative document of 1923 the Anglican signatories "find it impossible to regard" non-episcopal ministries as "invalid," that is, as null and void; and express a "wish that the terms 'valid' and 'invalid' could be discontinued." They prefer to say "that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. Yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective."* If valid means "effective," then the opposite to it is here taken to be not "ineffective," but "defective": and the result is to leave us in a state of doubt as to what our attitude towards non-episcopal ministries is in practice to be. Are they to be treated as "valid" but "irregular"? And, if so, does such "irregularity" in a minister leave him in a position to consecrate a "valid" Eucharist? It may be worth while to note how, for several ages, the distinction between "validity" and "regularity" was obscured: and how, at first, by St. Augustine and, finally, by St. Thomas Aquinas the principles at stake

* "Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry," in *Documents on Christian Unity*, edited by G. K. A. Bell (*O.U.P.*, 1924).

were made clear: though it was a long time, even after St. Thomas, before the words "valid" and "invalid" came into common use. Our best guide will be J. Tixeront, *L'Ordre et les Ordinations*,* who, on the points in question, summarizes L. Saltet, *Les Réordinations*,† an elaborate treatise which was soon afterwards introduced to English readers by Dr. John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, in *Ordination Problems*.‡ Of this treatise the Bishop writes that the author "is very helpful in asserting the judgment of the ancient Church as to the conditions of a valid Ordination, and he gives in a compact and telling manner some of the practical reasons why the Church has come to the conclusion which it has reached. On the general conclusion, both as regards the Sacraments in general and as regards Ordination, we are in complete agreement with him."§ A high commendation from so great an authority.

## I

The present position in the Western Church is this: that, where the bishop who confers Orders belongs to the Catholic Church and there exercises his ministry normally, there is no doubt about his Ordinations.‖ They fulfil the four requirements of (1) the right matter—laying on of hands; (2) the right form—appropriate prayer; (3) a recipient or "subject" properly qualified;¶ and (4) a competent minister. But before the days of St. Thomas Aquinas, doubts arose in respect of the fourth requirement, and questions were raised about Ordinations conducted by bishops who were heretical or schismatic. They began to appear in early times, and there followed twelve centuries of uncertainty, not to say confusion, before the doubts were finally settled by St. Thomas. In answer to the question "Whether heretics, and those who are cut off from the Church, can confer Orders?" he replied: "Bishops, even if cut off from the Church (since in no case can the power given in consecration, so long as the thing [given] remains, be lost), can confer Holy Orders, as also other Sacraments: those, however, who have been ordained by them receive neither the right to exercise

* Pp. 197 *sqq.* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1925).

† Paris: Lecoffre, 1907.

‡ S.P.C.K., 1909.

§ Pp. 8 and 10.

‖ Episcopus ordinationis minister ordinarius est episcopus consecratus . . . (*Codex juris canonici*, canon 951).

¶ Sacram ordinationem valide recipit solus vir baptizatus: licite autem, qui ad normam sacrorum canonum debitis qualitatibus, judicio proprii Ordinarii, præditus sit, neque ulla detineatur irregularitate aliove impedimento. *Ibid.*, canon 968, where note (1) that a woman cannot receive Holy Orders and (2) the difference between "valid" and "legitimate" ("licite"); the opposite to "legitimate" being "irregular."

their Orders received nor the grace [thereof]."* In so saying, St. Thomas went back to the teaching of St. Augustine: "Both Baptism and Orders," he says, "are Sacraments; and by a kind of consecration both are given to a man, the one when he is baptized and the other when he is ordained; and so, in the Catholic Church, neither may be repeated. From time to time there come from the Donatist party even prelates, who have exchanged their error for the blessing of peace, and are received. But even if it seems desirable that they should exercise the same offices which they formerly exercised, they are not reordained. But, as in the one case Baptism, so in this case Ordination, remains entire: for the fault was in the schism, now corrected by peace and unity, not in the Sacraments: which are everywhere one and the same."† In other words, there is a distinction, in Orders received, between two things: the power bestowed and the legitimate exercise of the power; and, in later language, the question is as to the former—*Validitas sacramentalis*: the latter, or *Validitas canonica*,‡ can be easily regularized.

But this distinction between "valid" and "regular" was long in doubt; and at present it seems likely to become obscured again. The confusion consequent upon ignoring it was serious, and in our day may easily become so again.

## II

There are three periods in the story:—

(1) During the first of these, from the first to the seventh century, the tendency was to regard the Ordinations conferred by heretics or schismatics as null and void. The earliest instance of this appears in the proceedings of Cyprian and Firmilian.

* *Q.* Utrum hæretici, et ab ecclesia præcisi, possint ordines conferre ?

*A.* Possunt episcopi, et ab ecclesia præcisi (cum nullo unquam casu potestas cum consecratione data re ipsa manente perdi queat), sacros conferre ordines, sicut et cætera sacramenta: ordinati tamen ab illis nullam susceptorum ordinum executionem suscipiunt aut gratiam (*Summa*, III[a] Pars, Suppl. Q. xxxviii., Art. 2).

† Utrumque [baptismus et ordo] sacramentum est et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, illud cum ordinatur, ideoque in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari. Nam si quando ex ipsa parte venientes, etiam præpositi, bono pacis correcto schismatis errore, suscepti sunt, etiamsi visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent quæ gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati, sed sicut baptismus in iis, ita ordinatis mansit integra quia in præcisione fuerat vitium quod unitatis pace correctum est, non in sacramentis quæ ubicumque sunt ipsa sunt (Aug., *Contra Epist. Parmen.*, II. xiii., § 28). Here note (1) the use of "integra" for "valid," as in *De Baptismo*, III. xv., § 20, which term ("validus") he does not use; but (2) "valere" is common—*e.g.*, in *De Baptismo*, I. xii., § 18; III. xiii., § 18, etc.; while (3) "illicite" is common for "illegitimate" or "irregular"—*e.g.*, Quod datum fuit non potest dici non datum quamvis recte dice possit illicite datum (*Contra Epist. Parmen.*, II. xiii., § 29; *De Baptismo*, III. x., § 13).

‡ For these phrases see Hefele, *Councils*, ii. 359, on CP. (381), c. 4.

It is part of the logic of their system. "He who separates himself from the communion of the Church and from the college of Bishops cannot have the authority of a Bishop."* The same tendency appears in the conciliar legislation of the fourth century. Thus the Council of Nicæa lays it down that "If anyone should dare to steal, as it were, a person who belongs to another (bishop), and to ordain him for his own church, without the permission of the bishop from whom he was withdrawn, the ordination shall be null";† and "the canon, if we construe it literally, implies that if the injured bishop should afterwards resolve to promote the offending cleric, he would treat the former ordination as null, and ordain him *de novo*."‡ Similarly the Council of Constantinople (381) "invalidates§ the consecration of Maximus and all ordinations performed by him, regarding him as not a bishop and persons ordained by him as not really ordained at all." "On this," as Dr. Bright observes, "the question arises, Did not the ancients treat some ministrations as invalid, which would afterwards have been treated as only irregular? . . ." They did: "But, as Hefele observes, such a distinction did not occur to the Church of this period, which, indeed, had not fully worked out its ideas. . . . Dreading and abhorring ecclesiastical disorder, the Fathers of the Council took the shortest way of suppressing it. If a bishop did an act involving a breach of discipline, their impulse was to say, 'It is invalid, we disown it utterly—we esteem it as null.'"‖

But things had to be thought out; and in the fifth century we find Augustine, in view of the Donatist problem, "formulating the principle that Sacraments schismatically, and therefore 'illicitly,' administered were realities, but their beneficial effects were suspended until the recipients came over to Church unity."¶ St. Leo the Great appreciated this difference between what we should now call "invalid" and "irregular"; and "wrote to Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne,** that bishops unduly

* Qui se ab ecclesiæ vinculo atque a sacerdotum collegio separat, episcopi non potestatem potest habere (*Ep.* lv., § 24; and *cf.* lxxv., § 7).

† Canon 16 (ἄκυρος is the word for "null"); Hefele, i. 423.

‡ W. Bright, *Notes on the Canons, ad loc.*

§ Canon 4: πάντων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν (*sc.* his consecration) καὶ τῶν πὰρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων; Hefele, ii. 359.

‖ Bright, *Notes on the Canons*, 54 *sq.* ¶ *Ibid.*

** Nulla ratio sinit inter episcopos habeantur qui nec a clericis sunt electi, nec a plebibus sunt expetiti, nec a provincialibus episcopis cum metropolitani judicio consecrati. Unde cum sæpe quæstio de male accepto honore nascatur, quis ambigat nequaquam istis esse tribuendum, quod non docetur fuisse collatum? Si qui autem clerici ab istis pseudoepiscopis in eis ecclesiis ordinati sunt quæ ad proprios episcopos pertinebant, et ordinatio eorum consensu et judicio præsidentium facta est, potest *rata* haberi, ita ut in ipsis ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem *vana* habende est creatio quæ nec loco fundata est nec auctore munita (Leo, *Ep.* clxvii. [A.D. *c.* 458 *vel* 459], Responsum I. [*P.L.* liv. 1203 A, B]).

elected, 'having received their dignity amiss,' were 'not to be reckoned among bishops,' and that no ordination of clerics by these 'pseudo-bishops' could be held *rata*, unless it were shewn to have had the consent of the lawful diocesan, failing which it must be deemed *vana*. We may reasonably infer that *rata* is here used in the sense of 'regular' and *vana* means 'such as can give to the persons thus ordained no right to officiate in the church.'"* But, in other regions, this doctrine, which finally prevailed, was not yet appreciated; and in the sixth century we find reordination imposed upon clerics who had come over from Arianism, their orders received in heresy being thus treated not merely as irregular but as null.†

(2) A second period followed from the seventh to the tenth centuries, when the difference between "invalid" and "irregular"‡ was either unknown or ignored; and reordination was imposed in cases of doubt, or Ordinations were quashed as the best way of dealing with political turbulence or ecclesiastical faction. A good instance of such reordination, but connected neither with turbulence nor faction, is that of Chad by Archbishop Theodore (*c.* 669), who, being himself a Greek, would naturally have proceeded in accordance with the Eastern custom of making no difference between "invalid" and "irregular." Just a hundred years later the clerks ordained by the antipope Constantine had their Orders annulled, though they might be reordained, by Pope Stephen III.: for his Lateran Council, 769, decreed that "If a priest or deacon has been consecrated bishop by him [*sc.* Constantine], he is to become priest or deacon again; but he may be elected bishop anew by the laity and clergy, and be consecrated by Pope Stephen. The like holds of those whom Constantine ordained as priests and deacons. They are to be put back to the degree which they had before, but Pope Stephen may ordain them again as priests or deacons."§ Similarly, in the tenth century, Sergius III., in a Roman Synod of 904, treated as null the Orders bestowed by Pope Formosus,‖ 891-6, and a Council of Rome, 964, under John XII., meted out the like condemnation to the Orders bestowed by his rival Leo VIII.¶ The violence and

* Bright, *Notes on the Canons*, 55 *sq.*

† So in France, at the Council of Orleans, c. 10 (A.D. 511), and in Spain at the Council of Saragossa, cc. 1, 3 (A.D. 592); Hefele, iv. 90 and 426.

‡ Bede, *H.E.* iv. 2. The Latin is: "At ille (Theodorus) dixit non eum (Chad) episcopatum dimittere (=give up the episcopal office) debere: sed ipse ordinationem ejus *denuo* catholica ratione consummavit." Here *denuo* implies the reconsecration of Chad; see *Bædæ Op. Hist.*, i. 205, and note in ii. 207 (ed. C. Plummer). Dr. Bright takes the other view that Theodore treated Chad's consecration as merely "irregular," and supplemented it by a confirmatory rite (*Chapters in English Church History*,[3] 261).

§ Hefele, v. 337 *sq.*

‖ H. K. Mann, *Lives of the Popes*, iv. 122.

¶ *Ibid.*, 263.

immorality of the times will account for such rough and ready treatment of opponents; but it continued in a more moral, but still not less turbulent, age.

(3) For in a third period, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the papacy was engaged in the strife against simony and lay-investiture, some of its supporters found their best weapon in the nullity of simoniacal Orders and the practice of reordination. Such was the line taken by Cardinal Deusdedit († *c.* 1097-1100), the friend of Pope Gregory VII. and supporter of his policy of ecclesiastical reform. But the opposite position had been adopted by St. Peter Damian († 1072), when "the question arose about the validity of the Ordinations of simoniacal clerics. He was appealed to and wrote, *c.* 1053, the *Liber gratissimus* in favour of their validity: a work which, though much combated at the time, was potent in deciding the question in their favour before the end of the twelfth century."* In the next century, the matter was settled once and for all: when St. Thomas Aquinas reasserted the teaching of St. Augustine that Orders bestowed in schism or heresy are, in modern terminology, valid though irregular.

## III

On what principle, then, did the rival schools proceed?

(1) Those who denied the validity of Orders conferred in heresy or schism and practised reordination proceeded fundamentally on the principle of Cyprian and Firmilian, who confused validity with efficacy—*i.e.*, the existence with the grace, or, in Augustinian language, the *res* with the *virtus* of the sacraments.† Sacraments, they argued, conferred outside the

* *The Catholic Encyclopædia*, xi. 765. *Cf. P.L.*, cxlv. 99-156. He quotes Leo, *Ep.* clxvii. (see above) in c. xxiv. to shew that a schismatic bishop can validly ordain—"Qui tamen aliis habet, quod sibi non habet; quia videlicet alios consecrare permittitur, cum et ipse inter episcopos non habeatur" (col. 136)—and Gregory the Great as forbidding reconsecration—"Sicut autem baptizatus semel, iterum baptizari non debet, ita consecratus semel in eodem ordine non valet iterum consecrari" (p. 145)—and clearly distinguishes between what subsequently came to be called *Validitas sacramentalis* and *Validitas canonica*, thus: "Aliud est enim quemlibet per synodalem sententiam in amissi ordinis jura restitui; aliud per consecrationis mysterium, quod iterari non potest, Spiritus sancti gratiam promereri; præsertim cum in eo, qui deponitur, quanquam dignitatis utendæ perdat extrinsecus privilegium, manet tamen nihilominus semel adepti ordinis sacramentum: sicut etiam manente in se sacramento regenerationis, excommunicatur reus cujuslibet criminis, nec caret eodem sacramento, etiamsi nunquam reconciliatur Deo" (p. 146).

† Augustine makes the distinction repeatedly: "Distinction—il le remarque—dont l'omission avait causé l'erreur de Saint Cyprien: 'Non distinguebatur sacramentum ab effectu vel usu sacramenti' [*De baptismo*, VI. i., § 1]: 'Aliud est non habere, aliud non utiliter habere' [*Ibid.*, IV. xvii., § 24]. Le sacrement peut donc exister, être valide, sans que le sujet reçoive la grâce qui devrait l'accompagner" (Tixeront, *Hist. des dogmes*, ii. 401). But the terms belong rather to his school than to himself.

Church could not bestow the grace. Starting from the African Creed—*Credo in remissionem peccatorem et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam**—they went straight to the conclusion that, as the Church is thus the home of grace, the Orders and other Sacraments of those outside it are null and void. Such was their contention in the first period. In the second, reliance was also placed on the subordination of the Sacraments, in respect whether of minister or of recipient, to the control of the Church; and, in the third, this was summarily stated by Cardinal Deusdedit between 1089 and 1095. "He held that reordinations are not forbidden by any text, and that it rests with the Church to approve or reject such reordination."† "It would be impossible," says M. Tixeront, "to put more explicitly the view that the validity of the Sacraments is an affair of canon law."‡ Thus it was that, owing to anarchy and rivalries, political and ecclesiastical policy took the place of principle: and parties arose which did not hesitate to crush their adversaries by the simple expedient of declaring their Orders invalid, and proceeding to reordination. Such were the parties bent, and rightly bent, on putting down simony and lay-investiture. They simply used the biggest stick they could find. The result was that the validity of the Sacraments came to be treated not as a question of theology, but of canon law. *Haec quæstio magis est decretalis quam theologica*, as Peter of Poitiers († 1215) was wont to say. In other words, they failed to distinguish between the validity and the legitimacy of the Sacraments; and in all questions concerning Holy Orders it is the former alone which fundamentally matters: principle and not policy. Irregularity can be removed, but mere regularity without validity is only a source of confusion and doubt.

(2) In the end, under the guidance of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, the Church rejected all these theories, and, distinguishing between the validity and the legitimacy of an Ordination, it taught that Ordination is always valid provided that a true bishop, whoever he be, fulfils on the ordinand the essential rites:§ but that, if the Ordination is to be legitimate as well, then bishop and ordinand must be in the position required by law; and it held that the Sacrament of Order, once received, cannot be repeated.‖

* Cyprian, *Epp.* lxix., § 7; lxx., § 2.

† Saltet, *Réordinations*, 246.

‡ Tixeront, *L'Ordre et les Ordinations*, 209.

§ Conc. Trid., Sessio VII., *De sacramentis in genere*, canon ix.; and Sessio XXIII., *De Ordine*, c. iv., canon iv., and *Cod. Iur. Can.*, c. 732.

‖ *Cod. Iur. Can.*, c. 951.

## IV

Thus the question throughout is of *Validitas sacramentalis*: for *Validitas canonica*, or the want of it, *i.e.* irregularity, can be adjusted; and the choice is not between validity and irregularity but between validity and nullity. And, indeed, this is the sense in which the term validity has commonly been used. Dr. Gore's suggestion, based on a sentence in St. Ignatius,* that "valid" means "secure" and its opposite is thus not "invalid" or "null" but "precarious," as "not having the security of the covenant,"† falls outside the customary use of the term. And of this the best witness is that of Hooker. "Suppose, therefore," he writes, "that . . . the law did not utterly prohibit baptism to be administered by any other than persons thereunto solemnly consecrated [*sc.* according to the Puritan theory, as preaching ministers], what necessity soever happen. Are not many things firm being done, although in part done otherwise than positive rigour and strictness did require? Nature as much as possible inclineth unto *validities* and preservations. Dissolutions and *nullities* of things done are not only not favoured, but hated, when either urged without cause, or extended beyond reach."‡ And this is the usual sense in which "valid" is employed, as in English law:§ as where a marriage, if not valid, is either void (or voidable).

To say, however, that Orders, or Sacraments in general, are invalid or null, does not mean that they are inefficacious; and besides the distinction between validity and regularity, we must make a further distinction between the validity and the efficacy of Christian ordinances. "The sense of validity in regard to them has been obscured by the assumption that, if the ordinances administered in the historical Catholic Church are alone valid, no grace can be had elsewhere. In the *Guardian* of October 16, 1889, Lord Grimthorpe asked: 'Do the deniers of the validity of the Eucharist when not administered by a priest mean that those who take it might as well take nothing?' Certainly not. We hold that they do not, indeed, receive the sacred gift contained in, and conveyed by,

* ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. Ign., *ad Smyrnæos*, viii., § 1. Lightfoot translates βεβαία as "valid" in his note *ad loc.*

† *The Church and the Ministry* (ed. 1919), p. 92.

‡ Hooker, *E.P.*, V. lxii. 13.

§ *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines "valid" as "good, or adequate in law; possessing legal authority or force; legally binding or efficacious—*e.g.* (1651), Hobbes, *Leviathan*, I. xv. 72: 'The nature of Justice consisteth in keeping of valid Covenants'"; and "*Eccl.*, Technically perfect or efficacious—*e.g.* (*c.* 1680), Beveridge, *Serm.* (1729), I. 28: 'Not but that the ordination is valid.'"

a valid Eucharist; but that if they come with right dispositions to the Lord's Supper, it becomes to them an occasion of communion with God and Christ which, being on their part earnest and sincere, cannot possibly fail to be accompanied with blessing. . . . To say 'God's grace is not tied to His own appointed ordinances' is one thing. To say 'Other than Church ordinances may, perhaps, be His ordinances, only we are not sure of it' is quite another.

"In other words, ordinances administered without due commission, *e.g.* Eucharists so-called administered by those who are not priests, and ordinations so called administered by those who are not bishops, are *invalid* for lack of due authority in the ministrant, *but* they may be *efficacious* in the sense of being the means or occasions of spiritual fellowship with God which is certain to win a blessing."* And this is the principle of the objectivity of the Sacraments,† or their validity as distinguished from their efficacy:‡ a principle worked out, at first, by St. Augustine and finally established by St. Thomas.§

## V

Ultimately, then, the whole question of validity runs up into the question whether this due authority, *i.e.* Christ's commission to the minister, reaches him through the bishop or in some other way.

(1) "Those who say that the ministry of those outside the Apostolic line (admitting that episcopacy is Apostolical) can be as valid as the ministry of those within it must really hold that validity attaches alike, in the Christian economy, to two methods of ministerial appointment: one from above the congregation, *i.e.* from the Apostolic line which, by supposition, inherits the charter given to the Apostles, another from the congregation itself. But, except the three Orders, there is no ministry extant which can derive itself from the Apostolic ministry. Therefore no other source of commission is left except congregational appointment. And what is traceable to no other source than this, though it may claim to be a true ministry of divine (*i.e.*, original) institution, must in fact rely

* W. Bright, *Sylva*, xxiii., No. 25 (unpublished MS.).

† Augustine, *De Baptismo*, iv., §§ 16, 18; *q.v.* in my *Doc. Ch. Hist.*, i., No. 215.

‡ *Ibid.*, i., § 18; *q.v.* in *Doc. Ch. Hist.*, i., No. 214.

§ Et ideo alii dicunt quod vera sacramenta conferunt, sed cum iis gratiam non dant, non propter inefficaciam sacramentorum, sed propter peccata recipientium ab eis sacramenta contra prohibitionem Ecclesiæ. Et hæc est tertia opinio: quæ est vera (*Summa*, III[a] Pars, Suppl. Q. xxxviii., Art. 2 [*Op.* IV., p. 505: Parmæ, 1854]).

on the supposed power of a Christian congregation to evolve a ministry and to empower it to act as such."*

(2) It is held, however, by some that the original commission was given not to the Apostles but to the Church: and this is the suggestion underlying the substitution of "the Historic episcopate" for "the Apostolic succession." But "that this great commission . . . was given directly to the Apostles, and only to the Church because the Apostles form part of the Church and are the divinely empowered organs of the Church, has been the general belief of Christians in all ages. It is only in relatively recent times that . . . any other view has been taken. . . . It is not 'some Anglicans' only who insist on this view of the matter, it is the whole tradition of the Christian Church from the beginning till recent times; and even now, in these latter days, some of the greatest names among Continental Protestants have accepted this interpretation—Meyer, Weiss, Godet, and Schmiedel."† If, then, the attempt is to be made to shew that the validity of Orders and Sacraments can be had otherwise than through the commission that has come down to us from our Lord through the Apostles and the Episcopate, the *onus probandi* lies with those who maintain this view. It is not enough to say that non-episcopal ministries are "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church: though in varying degrees irregular or defective"; for the statement, apart from its ambiguity,‡ does not go to the root of the matter. It is a judgment of policy, not of principle: because it has still to be fully thought out.

B. J. KIDD.

* W. Bright, *Sylva*, xxiii., No. 25. The originator of this congregationalist theory of the ministry seems to be Luther in the advice which he gave to the Bohemian Utraquists in November, 1523, to forgo their requirement of "episcopal ordination" and "choose their pastors for themselves" (Ranke, *Reformation*, 459 [Routledge, 1905]; and for the Latin original see my *Documents of the Reformation*, No. 65).

† F. W. Puller, *Orders and Jurisdiction*, 12, 13. It is the fullest and best account of the Apostolic Succession available in English, with full references to authorities—patristic, mediæval, English Reformers, and modern scholars (Longmans, 1925). Among the last, he quotes Godet: "*La théorie qui fait du pastorat une émanation et une représentation de l'Eglise, n'est pas biblique; cette charge est une émanation de l'apostolat, lequel procède de Christ:* il est ainsi médiatement une institution de Jésus lui-même" (*ibid.*, p. 15).

‡ *E.g.*, what are "real" ministries—"actual," "successful," or "valid"? And what is "the Universal Church"? The Holy Catholic Church? Or "all who profess and call themselves Christians," including Unitarians who do so profess themselves, and Salvationists and Quakers, who discard both Ministry and Sacraments?

# ALMSGIVING IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

*My impression is that it will be the cheque-book rather than the pass-book which will be wanted at the Day of Judgment.*—THE BISHOP OF ELY.

## I

ALMOST exactly a hundred years ago—that is, at the commencement of the Reformation, not of the doctrinal, but of the administrative system of the Church of England—the Rev. Henry William Wilberforce, M.A., of Oriel College, Oxford, curate of Bransgore, Hants, won the premium of two hundred guineas, offered by the Committee of the "Christian Influence Society," for an Essay on the Parochial System.* In this essay, now long since forgotten, he pleaded for the provision and endowment of new parishes, to make it possible for the National Church to cope with the phenomenal increase of the population.† The standard aimed at seems fantastically high compared with that to which we have ourselves become inured. "Let it be established that the population of no parish should exceed some definite amount, perhaps three thousand"; and to this he adds a footnote: "The proposed *maximum* may be thought too great; especially when it is remembered that the old parishes contained on an average less than 650. . . . It is certainly more liable to this than to the opposite charge; but it should be remembered that every such parish ought to have at least two resident ministers . . ." (p. 30). The longest section of the essay is devoted to "The measure of liberality and self-denial demanded by the principles of the Gospel"; and the writer gently chides the clergy for their comparative neglect of the "irksome task of exciting others to a liberal and self-denying bounty" (p. 108).

For the Anglican clergy of the present day the "irksome task" has become an unavoidable necessity. That is why Dr. Lowther Clarke's *Almsgiving : A Handbook*‡ is so opportune.

* *The Parochial System, an Appeal to English Churchmen.* (Rivington, 1838. Pp. 142, price 3s. 6d.)

† ". . . taking an average of thirty-four [London] parishes, we find the proportion of pastors to their flocks to be one to 15,100. Such is the condition of our metropolis. Many of the manufacturing and commercial towns are not much less destitute . . ." (*op. cit.*, p. 11). Today, according to the Bishop of Willesden (Chairman of the Forty-five Churches Fund), there are two districts of Greater London in which a missioner is ministering single-handed to the spiritual needs of a population of 14,000 (Belmont) and of 18,000 (South Whitchurch) respectively. (Whitsuntide Appeal, 1936.)

‡ *Almsgiving : A Handbook.* By W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. (S.P.C.K. Cloth, 2s.; paper, 1s.)

It tackles a very pressing problem with resolution and independence and a keen sense of reality. It offers, within its limits, a complete and comprehensive treatment of its subject. Moreover, it is as practical as it is erudite, stuffed with curious learning and shrewd homely wisdom, and nicely rounded off with Notes for Sermons.

The first part is historical, and reviews the Biblical evidence, the practice of the Early Church, and the history of almsgiving in England: "I think the interest here is more than academic, since the opposition to our exhortations arises largely out of prejudices which are deeply embedded in the Unconscious, having been formed by centuries of past theory and practice." The author reminds us that the revival of the weekly offertory in the first half of the nineteenth century met with violent opposition, being considered "Popish"; he might have added that it was, in fact, one of the primary causes of the mutiny of the "Rebel Clergy" of the Rural Deanery of Islington in 1843.*

The second part is both theoretical and practical: it involves an attempt "to re-think the principles of almsgiving" and "to bring almsgiving into relation with the rapidly changing social and economic conditions of our time." Dr. Lowther Clarke is critical of the distinction† between "paying a debt" (*i.e.*, contributing to church expenses) and "true almsgiving." There follows a discussion of getting and spending, an analysis of the motives that underlie our almsgiving, and a sympathetic examination of competing claims. Throughout we are made to bear in mind that "no suggestions in regard to almsgiving are likely to bear much fruit so long as Church-people think it necessary to live at the same rate of expenditure as their non-church-going neighbours" (p. 119).

Some would retort that Dr. Lowther Clarke fails to take into consideration, or at least seriously under-estimates, the potential resources of the National Church. As the result of an ingrained social tradition, of all the religious bodies in this country the Church of England remains notoriously the cheapest to belong to. The fantastic notion that the clergy of the Establishment are State-paid is far from dead even among educated people. In practice, if not in theory, the laity are accustomed to the clergy maintaining their religion (like Members of Parliament maintaining their political opinions) largely out of their own pockets. The Church of England is organized on the assumption (which is a legacy from the Victorian

* The other was the attempt to put a stop to the omission of the prayer for the Church Militant in the reading of the Communion Service. *Cf. A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London*, by Alfred Blomfield, 2nd ed., 1864, p. 252.

† Adopted by the Church Assembly Committee on the Principles of Christian Giving, in its Report (*Christian Stewardship*, 1932).

heyday) that something like a majority of incumbents have private means. Far too much is taken for granted by the general public: the parsimony of sight-seeing tourists and visitors to churches of historic interest has been the subject of a recent correspondence in *The Times* newspaper. The Church has somehow failed to grip the imagination of the moneyed classes: there is a noble profusion of legacies to hospitals or for the promotion of scientific research, but legacies to churches or even to the great missionary societies are, by comparison, sadly out of fashion: and it is rare indeed to hear of a rich man offering to build a church. The laity of the Church of England, compared with the Roman Catholics, the Nonconformists, or the Jews, have hardly as yet begun to learn to give.

Those who argue thus will argue also that there is no reason why, given time, this bad tradition should not be broken. It is principally a matter of education. In spite of every effort, the financial position has not yet been brought home to the laity in such a way as to make them personally conscious of their own obligations in respect of it. They do realize, more or less, that the Church is desperately hard-pressed for money: what they fail to realize is that they are the Church. ("The clergy are always begging.") In short, the potential resources of the Church of England are still, to a remarkable extent, untapped. It may therefore be argued that, for the present at least, the author's "Plea for Simplicity" is premature: the laity, and particularly those of them whose attachment to the Church is almost purely nominal—the "fashionable wedding" class—could give a great deal more than they do without appreciably feeling it.

But is that what we want? There is a memorable anecdote of Dean Hook as Vicar of Leeds. "One day when he was in need of funds for some special object he met a very rich man in the street who, on hearing of the matter, took him to his house and gave him a cheque for £300. Hook thanked him warmly. 'Well,' said the donor, 'you see, it is nothing to me.' And he waved his hand round, drawing attention to the sumptuosity of his establishment. Hook walked home, put the cheque into an envelope and returned it with a civil note of regret, saying he could not offer to God what the donor had told him had cost him nothing. The rich man thereupon and without delay sold two horses, cutting down what William Law used to speak of as his equipage, and in a few weeks sent Hook £1,000." Dr. Lyttelton, in the article* from which this anecdote is borrowed, also recalls that "Charles Gore told his pupils at Cuddesdon how Westcott preached a sermon at Harrow

* "Almsgiving and Modern Life," in *Theology*, July, 1934, pp. 17-27.

to shew that there had never been a real revival of religion without asceticism."

In any case, the time appears to be approaching when more heroic measures on the part of Church-people will indeed be necessary. For it is one of the most significant phenomena of the present day that all voluntary associations (and, from the secular point of view, the Church is a voluntary association), membership of which involves specific duties and monetary contributions, are battling against a strong head-wind of apathy; an apathy which, to vary the metaphor, may be described as individualism run to seed. The mood of the present generation is one of spiritual lassitude: its dominant desire is to be let alone, to "live one's own life," to "go one's own way," to be "independent." If the British Empire itself were a voluntary association, it is problematical how many even of the readers of the *Daily Express* would bother to "contract in." There is a widespread failure of the spirit of loyalty, and, in particular, of corporate loyalty. (This is conspicuously marked in what has been termed "the officer class" of the community; with the one beneficial consequence that in the pulpits of our public school chapels the cant of "Service" is now beginning to give way to the theology of the New Testament.) All voluntary organizations, whether religious, social, political, or patriotic, appear to be affected: the Church of England, the Socialist Party, the Territorial Army, the Boy Scouts' Association, the Communist Sunday Schools, are all together in the trough of the wave. How long this mood is likely to continue, it is impossible to predict.

So far as the future of the Church is concerned, the omens are strangely contradictory. On the one hand, the intellectual prestige of orthodox Christianity is probably higher at the present moment than it has been for the past fifty years: it seems almost incredible today that as recently as 1913 so acute and sympathetic an observer as Wilfrid Ward could still be writing: "The weight of intellectual authority tells heavily against the Church." The whole intellectual atmosphere has changed remarkably; and the average intelligent outsider, if not attracted by the Bishop of Birmingham, is very definitely impressed by the Archbishop of York and Mr. T. S. Eliot. On the other hand, the social prestige attaching to faithful membership and participation in the actual life of the Church stands somewhere below zero: church-going, in particular, has almost ceased to be socially respectable, and for an Englishman (who dreads above all to be thought eccentric) the practice of it often demands a certain amount of moral courage. It is obvious that this preposterous paradox will have to be resolved

in the near future. But—of course, with many honourable exceptions—the moneyed element in the population and the superannuated remnants of the minor aristocracy, taken by and large,* are naturally more sensitive to the social than to the intellectual temperature.

This, then, is the setting within which the financial necessities of the Church of England have become acute. There are, indeed, many other contributory causes. But the real horror of the situation is that, so long as it obtains, there will continue to be cures of souls, parochial and even diocesan, for which the *primary* qualification will be, not even the "good voice and delivery, keen interest in social work," desiderated by the pundits of the Ministry of Labour,† but a rather sordid ability for raising money.

So it might be argued: and the caustic wit of the editor of *Crockford* may be relied upon, if not to point the moral, at least to adorn the tale at the expense of that well-meaning body, the Church Assembly.‡ Yet does not the responsibility for the present stringency lie in large measure at the doors of our own parsonages? If people do not give, it is because they do not think; and if they do not think, it is because we have not taught them how to think, because we have not preached the Gospel, because we have been frightened of theology. The lack of imagination for which we are so apt to censure them is a phenomenon for which we have ourselves to blame. For two generations we have been preaching morality, and good conduct, and social service, and we have no right to be surprised and indignant if people now regard the Church as one of the social services, and prefer to bestow their money upon other social services which they regard as more scientific, more up-to-date, and more productive of results. Anglican homiletics have shewn a disproportionate concern with the peripheries—social, humanitarian, ecclesiastical—of the Faith, instead of being preoccupied with the very heart and marrow of it. We have been preaching about the things in which we are interested, instead of preaching about the things in which the Bible is interested. The habit of moralizing from the pulpit, which almost suffocated the piety of the Church of England in the eighteenth century, has returned to us, in modern dress, in that type of sermon of

* Needless to say, the reference here is not to the minor aristocracy itself, which is by no means superannuated in respect either of actual or of potential service to the community, but, primarily, at least, to those deracinated specimens of their order who reside (during the season) in the West End of London. The growth of flats in this area—probably the most sinister social phenomenon of our time—is aggravating very rapidly the process of deracination. How right old Cobbett was when he labelled the metropolis as "the WEN"!

† "Careers for Secondary School Boys"; *cf. Church Times*, Sept. 4, 1936, p. 253.

‡ *Cf.* Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1936, Preface, p. vi.

which Canon Sheppard's religious articles in the *Sunday Express* are not entirely a caricature. Indeed, it is perhaps the only human possibility where theology is disparaged or neglected: but it does not teach men and women to love the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ: and love is the only motive from which we give generously and unselfishly. If charity has grown cold, it is because we have been preaching "religion" when we ought to have been proclaiming the Gospel of the Son of God.

Perhaps this is implicit in Dr. Lowther Clarke's conclusion: "If any result emerges from our enquiry, it is that there is no short-cut to Church financial prosperity. *Almsgiving is a natural growth from a right attitude towards life on the part of converted Christians.* 'A zealous amendment of the whole life' of the Church is needed to solve our financial problems. If we seek first the Kingdom of God, as much money will come for God's work as He wills" (p. 131). There is little use in tinkering with external details: we have got to get back to bedrock: for example, it is a matter of primary importance that we should seriously endeavour to ascertain the *Biblical* meaning of this phrase "Kingdom of God": we have long been using it so carelessly as a synonym for our own Utopias and idealisms that we have almost forgotten what it means. Let us make sure—so far as we ever can make sure—that that which we are seeking is indeed *God's* Kingdom.

Finally, Dr. Lowther Clarke reminds us that it is always possible that it may be the will of God, who blesses the poor man, to keep His Church comparatively poor and struggling, and therefore always dependent upon Him (p. 130). "Let us do everything in our power to contribute generously ourselves and stimulate others to do the same. Then let us accept success or failure, knowing that what our Father does is good" (p. 134).

## II

Thus this admirable little Handbook concludes by calling us out of the depressions and embitterments which dog the parochial clergy in their more disgruntled moments, and carries us into an atmosphere in which the occasions of depression and bitterness are seen to be trivial and irrelevant. But there is one point, in the chapter on "Competing Claims," which seems to invite a little further consideration. "Another claim upon us all," writes Dr. Lowther Clarke, "is the support of good causes which are not distinctively religious and are still on a voluntary basis, such as hospitals, or the provision of recreation for the young. Some day these may all be taken over by the

State or the municipality, but, so long as they depend on charity, the Churchman must be ready to do his part. He is not commending his religion if he says, 'I have so much to do at my church that I cannot spare money for philanthropy, which may be left to the multitudes of well-disposed people who "go nowhere" and so escape the demands made on Churchmen.' In all such matters, whether family claims or the philanthropic activities of our neighbourhood, we should not fall below the standard expected generally from good citizens" (pp. 108-9).

Now, as regards the individual Christian citizen, the truth of this is undeniable, except in so far as the mere "commending his religion" is not, perhaps, the final test. But the real problem is that of collections in church, and how far or how often a parish can afford to divert them to "good causes which are not distinctively religious." I have myself known one incumbent who, after announcing a special collection (*e.g.*, for Earl Haig's Poppy Fund), used to award what he thought a suitable proportion to the fund in question, and deduct the balance for church expenses: but to do this without the congregation knowing that it is being done seems to me to be rather sharp practice. I have also recently read the following in a parish magazine: "The line adopted [here] is not to have collections in church for funds to which as citizens churchpeople would be contributing outside the church. For example, while earnestly commending the King George V. Memorial Fund, we had no collection in church, as there is to be a house-to-house collection throughout the town. We shall all give to that, and we cannot, with the additional burden (from which non-churchgoers are exempt) of supporting the whole machinery of the Church, afford to give twice. Churches are annually invited to give a collection to the 'Poppy Day Fund,' but as every churchgoer, in company with all citizens of goodwill, has previously purchased a poppy and given what he can, it is manifestly unfair to expect him to give again. We refuse to penalize our people in this way. Churchpeople, generally speaking, are the soul of generosity, but that is no reason why they should be exploited." It will be noted that this vicar makes the same assumption as Dr. Lowther Clarke, that the Churchman "should not fall below the standard expected generally from good citizens" in these matters. At the church in question occasional recourse is had to the expedient of "out-going" or "retiring" collections, supplementary to the ordinary collection during the service. I do not say that the solution indicated here is necessarily the ideal one: but, in the present state of Church finances, it seems to be worth considering.

## III

"I know it is difficult," said the Archbishop of Canterbury, presiding at the Annual Meeting of the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation (July 17, 1936), "I know it is difficult for the great bulk of our churchpeople outside to realize how much may depend upon sums which, to them, seem comparatively trivial. I shall never forget the particular lesson which I learned in that matter in the happy days when I was Bishop in the East End of London, in regard to one particular district, one of the most overcrowded and poorest in the East End. One of its ground landlords had been in the custom of giving contributions to the parishes in that area. As often happens, his agent one day recommended to him that it was necessary that he should reduce his subscriptions, and also, as sometimes happens in the case of agents, he suggested that he should begin with the Church. Accordingly the announcement was made in one particular parish that the contribution which this man had made of £25 a year would be withdrawn. The parson of the parish came to me and explained that if that contribution were withdrawn it would mean one of two things: either the parish must lose its perfectly invaluable nurse, who was a veritable mother to the women and children of that area, and, as that was unthinkable, the only other alternative was that he and his family, living all the year round in that dim and dreary part of overcrowded East London, would be obliged to forego any chance of a holiday. I happened to know this ground landlord, and I felt sure of his real disposition in these matters, and I represented these facts to him. He wrote back saying: 'I never realized in my whole life that £25 could make such an enormous difference to anybody.' Of course, I need scarcely say that the contribution was immediately renewed."

Much, then, may be accomplished if we can once bring home to the hearts and minds of our lay-people the extent, the variety, and the appalling urgency of the demands by which the Church of England in this generation finds herself confronted both at home and overseas, and the cruel inadequacy of the resources available for the satisfaction of those demands. Much may be accomplished if we can teach them to recognize themselves as personally responsible. But they must be taught to recognize that they are responsible for the well-being of the Church, not because it is "their own show," but because it is "God's show": and therefore "well-being" is not to be equated—that would be too easy—with financial solvency. It would be a mistaken enthusiasm that should reduce the Church of God to terms of secular enterprises and organizations.

The Church is the place in which, pre-eminently, witness is borne to the glory of God made manifest in Christ crucified and risen. "The Church is not an establishment and institution and then possibly in addition *communio sanctorum*. . . . Its commission is also immediately its life. . . . This commission consists in witnessing by means of the *preaching of the Gospel* and the *administration of the Sacraments*."* All this is not irrelevant to the discussion of the practical, technical problem of raising and of giving money. On the contrary, the whole matter of almsgiving is subordinate to it, is controlled by it, is ultimately meaningless (other than as the arrogance of human piety) except precisely in this context, which is its context in the theology of the New Testament.

CHARLES SMYTH.

* Karl Barth, *Credo*, p. 143.

# MISCELLANEA

## BIRTH CONTROL

In the March number of Theology there appeared a forcible article by Mr. Sampson, headed " The Logic of Birth Control." Its main contention was that, whatever may be the ethical aspect of the question, the prevalent practice of contraception is justified, for the large majority of its votaries, by nothing else but the acute and painful alternative—total or partial abstinences for long periods of time. But the argument or plea of the practical impossibility of continence is used with not equal but considerable force in favour of fornication; also by homosexualists with the most calamitous results on our community life. Therefore the Lambeth Resolution was a most grievous blunder.

It is undeniable that the effects mentioned have followed from the attitude taken up not only by some Bishops but by a considerable number of clergymen and laymen of the highest character. The results of the lenient tone adopted could hardly have been unforeseen. What was it, then, that prevented the majority of Bishops from simply repeating the Resolutions of 1910 and 1920, which, though not identical, both spoke in terms of strong reprobation ?

It is not easy to answer the question, because out of a large number of men there must have been several who gave way to the influence of a strangely concessive and tolerant generation: a generation which for some time has been insisting on the folly of Church authorities dealing always in prohibitions, and has come to imagine that a practice so prevalent cannot be wrong though it may be dangerous. These, however, are not the ones who acted on principle: they need not be considered here. What we have to discern is the principle on which thoughtful men both at Lambeth and elsewhere have hesitated to condemn the practice in question.

Some of the voters for the Resolution, though in sympathy with the old-fashioned opinion, conceded the point because of the terrible descriptions of marital recklessness and cruelty in the overcrowded slums, women being practically done to death by incessant child-bearing and so forth. Such pictures have all along had a very considerable effect on compassionate people. But their tone and attitude do not give us the principle we are seeking. For the plain truth is that some 80 per cent. of contraceptionists do not live in slums but in decent dwellings permitting of separate bedrooms or of any other necessary condition favourable to the policy of abstinence. The slum dwellers have generally been spoken of as " abnormal cases." What we want to learn is the most plausible and powerful argument in favour of contraception for the vast majority of married couples who cannot plead overcrowding or any other unnatural impediment to perfect liberty of action.

The plea of course is this: that abstinence from conjugal intercourse mars and undermines the sacred unity of the married life and prevents the third purpose of marriage from being fulfilled—viz., the mutual society, help and comfort. In other words, cohabitation is the *signum*

*efficax amoris*, and if it is interrupted the mutual affection of husband and wife is seriously jeopardized.

That plea expresses a truth, but at the same time contains a fallacy. The truth is that the sexual act is not only the symbol of the spiritual union between man and woman, but is in actual fact the consummation of the closest physical union possible of the two. That is the explanation of Christ's words: " they two shall be one flesh "; also of St. Paul's terrific warning against fornication, namely, that the act brings about a complete physical intermingling of two bodies, that of the sinner with that of the harlot (1 Cor. vi. 15, 16). Such consummation of union, when hallowed by the Church, is " sublimated " and transformed into an act symbolical of the closest spiritual union possible and efficaciously promotes the union. That is what Edward Thoing meant when he boldly declared to a Church Congress audience that " conjugal intercourse is a pure act ": on which the comment of a wise man was, " We should be in a bad way if it were not." It also sheds a light on a fine saying of the German philosopher, Rothe: that while sexual intercourse gives the keenest physical gratification known to man, it is not to be witnessed by mortal eyes: only by the angels of heaven. It is more than doubtful whether either of these prophetically minded men would have so spoken of contraception. What, then, is the fallacy ?

The fallacy is in assuming that there is no essential difference between the natural complete sexual act and the act incomplete, artificially interrupted and marred by contraception. But there is all the difference possible. The significance and interpretation of the one lie in the completeness of the physical union; but the significance, purpose, and intention of contraception lie in incompleteness, separation, and disunion. The one, because it is by nature physically unitive, may help to promote the ideal progress of two souls through Eros to Agapé: through the physical to the spiritual. The other by marring the physical union is separative in meaning and intention: it checks and forbids that passage into the spiritual which is the crowning glory of the marriage union. It is a calculated attempt to retain the essentially transient element of physical passion, and thereby eliminates the possibility of the transformation of earth into heaven: of the temporal into the eternal.

Some such explanation, however clumsily expressed, is required for the undeniable strength of the instinctive repulsion felt for contraception, not only by the piously disposed but by many who practise it; not only by the Christian Church today but by the consensus of our spiritual forefathers, reaching back far into Old Testament times.* If there is any truth in the contention that the practice is a safeguard of the spiritual union of man and woman, what possible explanation is there of the verdict of such men as W. E. Gladstone, Andrew Clark, the great physician, and R. H. Hutton of the *Spectator*, expressed independently some sixty years ago: " Horrible !" That was all. It is idle to maintain that this repulsion is nowadays confined to the dwindling number of puritans alien from the heart of the problem or deficient in natural passion. We must not forget that there is every inducement for ordinary human beings to defend and uphold a practice which affords relief from an almost

* It is worth mentioning that Onanism, flatly condemned in Gen. xxxviii., is the contraceptive method that has always been prevalent in France, and is most certain to be adopted by the slum-dwellers everywhere. I have been told that 80 per cent. of medical men in England condemn it as injurious.

intolerable tension between opposing claims, and that that inducement has been operative not only today but always. Yet in spite of it the instinctive repulsion persists, and again is not confined to the strait-laced or the old-fashioned. What are we to make of the pathetic complaint of a contraceptionist to Dr. Gore: "Of course it's very beastly, but what are you to do?" Is it not a woeful conclusion that we are obliged to draw —viz., that the consciences of millions of baptized Christians have been defiled by a natural misinterpretation of the Lambeth Resolution?

There is, however, one rejoinder possible to this argument. It might be urged that the contrast we have insisted on between the natural sexual act and contraception, though logically sound, is too fine-drawn for plain people: that if there is no perceptible difference in sensation we are not wrong in inferring that the unitive effect of the one may rightly be ascribed to the other.

Does this reasoning carry conviction? We must remember that we have to listen to things said by men who have made up their minds, not on the abstract question whether the thing is in itself right, but whether they themselves are to take up this particular cross or not. This latter is for them settled. With these for the moment the Church is not concerned. She is concerned with those of her children who shew that they cannot quite stifle the scruples within them by the eagerness with which they asseverate that they are stifled. If contraception were really a means of safeguarding in perpetuity the unity of the married life and always had been, why this ceaseless defence of the practice? No one goes about saying that it is not wrong to eat. "If some poor wandering child" of God were to arise and preach that eating is wrong, we should not argue with him but pity him as one demented. But when we come across a married couple whom we cannot for a moment suspect of failing in self-mastery, we do not call it *dementia* but heroism, or as the doctors put it: "Abstinence will do you no harm if you are strong enough." All the evidence goes to shew that the instinctive and ineradicable misgiving among contraceptionists themselves is the voice of conscience not yet silenced: and conscience for the Christian is the pleading of the Holy Spirit of God.

At this point we are reminded by the Master of Corpus, Cambridge, that what is happening in the Church has happened before. The Church once forbad usury and now does so no longer. But, as Canon Quick has remarked, that proves nothing except that the Church has power to change its mind. If in a particular matter the Church does change its mind it may be acting quite constitutionally and yet the change may be a mistake. If it is not a mistake time ratifies it, as in the case of usury: but there is no prospect of this change being ratified. Moreover, it is not a change of mind so much as a change of conduct; a very different thing. It looks as if a number of Churchmen were trying to change their minds but cannot; and if this is really the issue of this controversy it is of all results the most deplorable. Lastly, the two things are not *in pari materia*. Usury was condemned, presumably, for its supposed results. What is wrong in contraception is in the essence of the act itself. (For disguise it as we may, it is difficult to repel the blunt accusation made against it many years ago that it is in essence mutual self-abuse. It has become necessary to call a spade a spade, because it is nowadays contended that, speaking physiologically, there is much to be said for this practice in moderation.)

What is here said is a repetition of Mr. Sampson's argument. His critic in the April number of THEOLOGY has the better of the argument if the premiss discussed above were sound—viz., that there is no essential difference between contraception and natural conjugal intercourse. If the premiss is disallowed Mr. Sampson's warnings of the results of contraception are forcible and must not be ignored.*

Let us remember that however severe may be the tension and the perplexity when perfect agreement between man and wife seems impossible, there is no limit to the significance of God's promise to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask. All the most baffling problems of conduct today are due to our languid belief in the Pentecostal Gift.

In conclusion let us revert to the claim made by the votaries of the line of least resistance: that it safeguards the matrimonial union. An agreement between two human beings to follow a line of conduct lower than that approved by conscience means a partnership in progress down the Broad Way. But agreement to help each other to live in obedience to the Law of the Cross† simply because it is Divine brings about perhaps the most beautiful manifestation of the Kingdom of Heaven upon this earth: a truly Christian home, where young souls are trained in an atmosphere of that renunciation of the world which St. Paul speaks of as the transformation of humanity by "the renewing of the mind."‡

E. LYTTELTON.

---

## THE FINDINGS OF THE FARNHAM CONFERENCE.

OCTOBER 14–16

(*Reprinted by permission from "The English Catholic."*)

(1) That since worship is man's response to God, inspired by His Spirit, it must of necessity have as its primary aim the Glory of God, and not the satisfaction of the worshipper.

(2) That, since the worship of the Church is the offering made by the Mystical Body of Christ, the words of the liturgy must be audible to the worshippers, so that they may take a full and understanding part in the corporate act.

(3) That, as the Altar is the symbol of the Presence of Christ, the Church should be designed worthily to enshrine it. The Altar should not be designed merely as an ornament of the Church. It follows that nothing should be placed on the Altar that is not absolutely essential, and that everything that is brought into connexion with the Altar should be

* When first this matter was discussed in public some fifty years ago, I heard a scientist, speaking with studied impartiality, state that the physical pleasure of contraception soon began to wane. It could hardly be otherwise if there be any moral misgiving at the start (James iv. 17). Ruskin remarked that no one ever yet found joy in a sinful act. Yet many thousands have affirmed the contrary, but has anyone really believed them ?

† The evidence given by French priests shows that contraception makes for disunion. Moreover, if practised from the start it prevents the marriage from being consummated.

‡ Rom. xii. 2. A valuable practical injunction to all married members of the Church of Christ to sanctify their union by prayer on each occasion of intercourse, will be found in *National Life*, in an unsigned article called "The Matrimonial Union." Apply to the office of the League of National Life, 53, Victoria Street, S.W. 1.

subordinate to it, and not distract attention from it. (There is no authority in the Church of England for placing more than two candles on the Altar.) Its true dignity is best manifested by simplicity in treatment of its surroundings. The Altar should always be covered, except on the last three days of Holy Week.

(4) (*a*) Following ancient custom, the principal act of worship in every parish should be a solemn celebration of the Holy Eucharist at an hour at which it is most convenient for the greatest number to communicate. (9 or 9.30 is found to be a convenient hour in an increasing number of parishes.) Wherever possible the Celebrant should be assisted by Gospeller and Epistoler, and also by other ministers.

(*b*) The participation of the People should be encouraged, not only by their hearing the words of the liturgy, but by their suiting their actions to the different parts of the service—*e.g.*, sitting to hear the Epistle, standing throughout the Offertory, for the Preface and Sanctus, for the Gloria, and pre-eminently by taking part in the Act of Communion. It is the duty of the Priest to ensure that the People should have the same opportunity of taking part vocally in a service that is sung as in one that is said.

(*c*) The integrity of the rite is most clearly manifested if—according to an ancient practice—the elevation of the elements and all acts of reverence on the part of the Celebrant and other ministers be deferred until the close of the Prayer of Consecration.

(5) Many prevalent mistakes arise from a failure to recognise the solemn obligation that rests upon the clergy to carry out the rites and ceremonies of the Church according to the Use of the Church of England. Since doubt exists concerning the meaning of the words "lawful authority" in the Declaration of Assent required of every clergyman, we earnestly hope that as soon as possible the two Convocations will, with the approval of the Church Assembly, draw up a Synodical Declaration that the services of the Book of Common Prayer should always be regarded as the normal standard of worship and that no deviation therefrom should be sanctioned by any bishop except with the approval of, or in conformity to the principles laid down by, the Convocations with the approval of the Church Assembly.

(6) Strong expression was given at the Conference to the need of the ordinand for more detailed authoritative guidance regarding the spiritual and ceremonial aspects of his duty as a minister at the Altar.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### ENGLISH ORDERS

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Fr. St. John, O.P., in his clear and courteous letter printed in your November issue, maintains that I have been guilty of confusion between the internal and external aspects of sacramental intention, which, as he points out, are expressly distinguished in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*. For the sake of clarity I quote the relevant passage in that Bull:

"The Church does not judge about the mind and 'intention,' in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge of it.

"When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due 'form' and the 'matter' requisite for effecting or conferring the Sacrament,* he is considered by that very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention† of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what, by the institution of Christ, belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament."‡

Now the language of the Bull is not altogether unambiguous. At first it speaks of the necessity of using the requisite Form and Matter; those who do this, even if they are heretics or unbaptized, confer valid Sacraments. Then the Bull goes on to consider a "change of rite." Now a change of rite may imply the disuse of the due Form and Matter, but it does not necessarily imply this. The compilers of the Edwardian Prayer Books, for instance, certainly "changed the rite" of Holy Baptism; but they retained the use of the requisite Form and Matter of Baptism. So it is a question whether the Bull's phrase "if the rite be changed" means "if a departure is made from the existing form of service" or "if a departure is made from the use of the requisite Form and Matter."

Fr. St. John's interpretation of the Bull is quite clear. For though he quotes much of the above passage almost *verbatim*, he makes one notable change in phraseology. Where the Bull says "if the rite be changed," he says definitely "if the prescribed form or matter be changed." And he goes on to say: "The internal intention . . . of the person using a *new* form and matter not authorized by the Church, and rejecting what she teaches, has a new external manifestation which lacks the Church's authority and is contrary to her mind. A person making use of such a *new* form or matter does not, therefore, intend to do what the Church does." (Italics mine.)

Now the Anglican Revisers of the Ordinal may have done one of two things. Either they introduced a rite which contained a "new form or matter," and omitted the Form or Matter requisite to the conferring of the Sacrament of Orders; or they merely introduced a "new rite," which, while differing in words and structure from other accepted rites of Ordination, retained the necessary Form and Matter that the Church employs to confer that Sacrament.

If the former is true, then *cadit quæstio*. If the Anglican Ordinals are defective in either Form or Matter, there is no need to enquire into the Revisers' intention. Now the Bull, while not alleging that the Anglican Ordinal of 1550 was defective in respect of Matter, does allege that it was defective in respect of Form. The grounds alleged seem to be two: (*a*) the Order conferred is not expressly mentioned at the moment of the Imposition of Hands; (*b*) there is no explicit mention throughout the entire

* Quum quis ad sacramentum conficiendum et conferendum materiam formamque debitam serio ac rite adhibuit.

† Eo manifesto consilio.

‡ Translation from A. S. Barnes, *The Popes and the Ordinal.*

rite of the "power of consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord."* If these omissions can be shewn to render the rite of 1550 defective in Form, then the Bull's discussion of the intention of the Revisers is a purely subsidiary and superfluous argument.

The Anglican apologist, however, maintains that the Form of Ordination contained in the Ordinal of 1550 is in all respects adequate. For there is no single formula of words common to all rites of Ordination which can be singled out as the necessary Form of Ordination, in the same way that the Trinitarian formula can be singled out as the necessary Form of Baptism. The Form of Ordination therefore consists in a Prayer or Prayers which make clear the significance of the ceremony of Imposition of Hands, as conferring the Sacrament of Holy Orders, and explicitly make mention of the Order of the Ministry which is thereby conferred. Nor is it necessary that the Order conferred should be expressly named at the moment of the Imposition of Hands. The Anglican Ordination rite fulfils these requirements, and can therefore only be impugned on the ground that there must be an explicit mention of the "power of consecrating and offering" in the course of the rite. But such explicit mention of this particular sacerdotal function is lacking in many primitive ordinals. This explicit reference to the "power of offering" cannot therefore be held to be part of the necessary Form of Ordination; and its absence in the Anglican Ordinal cannot *in itself* render ordinations conferred by that rite invalid.

I have laboured this point because of the suggestion contained in Fr. St. John's letter to the effect that the Revisers of the Ordinal introduced a "new form or matter." We maintain that their introduction of a "new rite" and their abandonment of the words and structure of the Pontifical did not carry with it an abandonment of the essential Form of Ordination. The changes in rite made by the new Ordinal are precisely parallel to those made in 1549 in the baptismal rite, where the Revisers retained the essential Form and Matter of the Sacrament, while modifying and altering the subsidiary prayers and ceremonies which had hitherto accompanied Holy Baptism. If our contention be sound, then we are prepared to take our stand on the *dictum* of Leo XIII.: "When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due 'form' and the 'matter' requisite for effecting and conferring the Sacrament, he is considered by that very fact to do what the Church does." Since it is impossible to maintain that explicit reference to the "power of offering" is necessary to the validity of the Form of Ordination, we are not surprised to find that the Bull itself and its defenders lay stress on the allegation of a defect in intention rather than that of a defect in the Form of Anglican ordinations; and that the Bull's phraseology blurs the distinction between a change in rite and a change in the essentials of Form and Matter.

Let us assume, however, that the sentence of the Bull quoted is untrue, and that even if the due Form and Matter are used, a change in rite is in itself sufficient to cast doubt on the intention of those responsible for that change. It is interesting to observe the opinion of Roman Catholic theologians on such a case. St. Thomas states clearly enough: "If he (who pronounces the words) intends by an addition or subtraction of this kind to introduce another rite which is not accepted by the Church it seems that the Sacrament is not validly performed,† because it does not

* Potestas consecrandi et offerendi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini.

† Non videtur perfici sacramentum.

appear that he intends to do what the Church does."* This sentence at first sight seems to tell strongly against the validity of Orders conferred by the Anglican Ordinal, and indeed is quoted as against their validity by Pohle-Preuss.† But subsequent words of St. Thomas make clear that he refers to the essentials of the Form by which the Sacrament is conveyed. For he goes on to say: "If something be admitted which is not a substantial part of the form,‡ such a subtraction does not destroy the necessary purport of the words§ nor consequently the valid performance of the Sacrament." In this connection he contrasts the invalidity of a baptism in which the baptizer fails to mention the name of one of the three divine Persons with the validity of a consecration of the Eucharist where the celebrant omits the word *enim* from the accepted Form, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*. If, therefore, St. Thomas's words are to be taken as relevant to the Anglican Ordinal's omission of reference to the "power of offering," it must first be proved that such reference forms part of the essential Form of Ordination. To maintain this, we claim, must necessarily involve the repudiation of the validity of the ancient Roman rite of Ordination, and consequently the validity of Orders transmitted in the Roman Church itself.

Bellarmine's views are particularly interesting in view of the fact that much of his theology is directed against the Protestant Reformers, and he can hardly be charged with ignorance of their practices. He writes: "It must be considered whether he who intends to introduce a new rite intends to introduce an essentially new rite|| in respect of the whole Church of Christ—that is, a rite which did not before exist in the true and universal Church; or whether he intends to introduce a new rite in respect to some Church, which he himself thinks a false one. If he intends to introduce a new rite absolutely, then the Sacrament is not validly performed, not because there is a defect in form, but because there is a defect in intention. . . . But if he intends to introduce a new rite, not absolutely, but in respect to some Church which he himself thinks a false one, and meanwhile intends to do what the true Church does; then the Sacrament is validly performed, even if he is mistaken in his judgment upon the true Church. As, for example, if some Greek, when he baptizes with the words, 'Let the servant of Christ be baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' intends to introduce a substantially new and necessary rite as against the Roman Church (so that he wishes to maintain that the Sacrament is invalid if one says, 'I baptize thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'), and yet intends to do what the true Church does, whatever that Church may be, he will indeed baptize, notwithstanding his error. . . . For the minister of the Sacrament is not bound to intend to do what the Roman Church does, but only what the true Church of Christ does."¶

It can hardly be maintained that Bellarmine is dealing merely with the "internal intention" of the minister, since the instance he gives is one of the deliberate introduction of a new sacramental formula in direct opposition to current Roman practice, and with a view to contradicting

* *Summa* III, lx. 8.

† *The Sacraments*, IV, ii. 1, ii. 3.

‡ Quod non sit de substantia formæ.

§ Non tollit debitum sensum verborum, et per consequens ne sacramenti perfectionem.

|| Novum essentialem ritum.

¶ *De Controversiis*, de Sacramentis in genere, i. 21.

Roman sacramental teaching. The passage has therefore a direct bearing on the question of the validity of the Anglican Ordinal. Fr. St. John agrees with my statement, as against Dr. Messenger, that the Preface to the Ordinal shews that the Revisers intended to " continue " those Orders which had been in Christ's Church " since the Apostles' time," though he adds a rider that their intention was " to continue those Orders purged from certain elements which they regarded as accretions forming no part of the teaching of the primitive Church." (He states that this intention is *explicit*; it is certainly nowhere made explicit in the Ordinal or in its Preface.) But according to Bellarmine's teaching, even if the Revisers deliberately intended by their alterations to oppose the practice and doctrine of the Roman Church of their time, that intention would not render ordinations conferred by their rite invalid, provided that the Revisers intended to " do what the true Church does." That such was their intention the Preface to the Ordinal makes abundantly clear.

In general, Fr. St. John's argument seems to assert two propositions: (*a*) that the " power of offering " is such an essential function of the office of the priesthood that any repudiation of the view that that office involves the " power of offering " must constitute an explicit intention not to continue that office; (*b*) that the Anglican Revisers of the Ordinal did in fact make such a repudiation by omitting any reference to this power, the purpose of this omission being made clear by the language of Cranmer* elsewhere in an explicit denial that any " power of offering " existed. If either of these propositions can be proved untrue, the argument falls to the ground. I maintain that both are untrue.

Proposition (*a*) implies the belief *either* that all the functions of the priesthood arise from and are determined by the " power of offering," *or* that there are a series of independent powers in the priesthood of which the " power of offering " is one. It is not true if (as I have maintained) the " power of offering " is not something distinct from the function of " ministering the Sacraments," and if the ministry of the Sacraments is closely connected with the ministry of the Word in the sense that sacramental functions are performed by priests in virtue of their pre-eminence as teachers, pastors, and governors of the Church. History is strongly on the side of the view that the power of consecrating and offering is exercised by bishops and priests because they hold the position of rulers and " elders " in the Church. The Holy Sacrifice is essentially the offering of the whole Church. It may not therefore be celebrated " apart from the bishop," who is the local ruler of the Church, nor otherwise than as the Church determines (*e.g.*, with a bishop or priest as celebrant). It seems impossible to justify at the bar of history the assertion of the Council of Trent to the effect that the Lord " constituted the Apostles priests " at the Last Supper, bestowing upon them at that time a power independent of their other apostolic functions. Even if we accept the view that the words, " Do this in remembrance of Me," form part of the original text of St. Luke's gospel,† it remains true that the other Synoptists did not regard these words as of sufficient importance to be recorded in their accounts of the Last Supper; and we may contrast this omission with the care that they took to record the names and calling

* Fr. St. John speaks of the views of " Cranmer and the other compilers." But, *pace* Dr. Messenger, the identity of the other compilers must remain a matter of conjecture.

† Such a conservative critic as Gore in the *New Commentary* doubts this.

of the Twelve at the beginning of the Lord's ministry, and the commission given to the Apostles after the Resurrection (the latter being clearly recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, and forming part of the content of the endings which editors have supplied for St. Mark's gospel). The history of the primitive Church strongly suggests that the duty of celebrating came to be the prerogative of a ministry whose functions were conceived to be primarily pastoral and presidential. In this connection we may note that many ancient Ordinals* give as the Old Testament type of the Christian priesthood the elders appointed by Moses, officials whose duties were governmental and not sacrificial. That the Church came gradually to understand more fully all that was involved in the priesthood, and consequently came to lay greater stress on the power of offering, I should certainly not wish to deny; nor do I wish to assert that this development of conception was false or misguided. But this is a very different theory from that which asserts that the words of the Lord at the Last Supper were understood from the first as clearly conveying sacrificial powers, and as constituting an " ordination " of the Apostles. It does not seem to me that the latter theory has any basis in fact.

With regard to proposition (*b*) the language of the Prayer Book and Ordinal makes clear that the Anglican Reformers regarded the celebration of the Lord's Supper as the prerogative of the priesthood and one of its essential functions. Now the essential element in the eucharistic sacrifice consists in the consecration of bread and wine, which become the Body and Blood of Christ, in accordance with the Lord's institution. The Reformers may have failed to recognize that such an action is a sacrificial one. They may not have believed that the bread and wine so consecrated become, really and objectively, the Body and Blood of Christ. But these opinions, even if they could be shewn to have been held by all the liturgical Revisers, and all the prelates who accepted the revision, certainly did not carry with them the intention to celebrate the Lord's Supper otherwise than as the Lord instituted, or an intention not to ordain priests whose prerogative it should be to perform at the Lord's Supper that which the Lord intended should be performed. Inasmuch as the Reformers clearly identified the purpose of consecration with the Dominical purpose, they did in fact intend to convey to priests at their ordination all the powers necessary for the carrying out of what the Lord intended should be done. And those powers include the *potestas consecrandi et offerendi*, a power to consecrate bread and wine to become the sacred Body and Blood. The extent of the Reformers' failure to recognize this does not affect their intention to do what the true Church, founded by Christ, intends to do, either in consecration or ordination.

And here lies the crux of the matter. Fr. St. John maintains that the external intention of the Revisers of Prayer Book and Ordinal is inadequate because they rejected the eucharistic theology of the Church of their day. They did not, therefore, intend to do what the Church intended to do, because (as he holds) the intention of the Church of their day must be identified with the intention of the true Church. But evidence of departure from the contemporary Church's intention is only significant if it can be shewn to constitute evidence of departure from the Lord's intention. It becomes irrelevant when there is clear identification of purpose with His intention. The Reformers may have misunderstood that intention,

* See E. C. Messenger, *The Reformation, the Mass, and the Priesthood*, chaps. v. and vi., for instances.

but they made clear that they intended to fulfil that observance which the Lord had at His Last Supper instituted and commanded to be continued. They made clear that through their ordinations they intended to continue offices which they rightly regarded as having existed in substance from the first, and as fulfilling the ministry instituted by the Lord. Even if it could be proved that there was no trace of unsoundness in pre-Reformation ideas concerning the Mass and the Real Presence, as popularly taught and as expressed in such documents as the recantation of Berengar, or that the Reformers' reintroduction of the Communion of the people as an integral part in the offering of the holy Sacrifice was not a wholesome step in restoring a primitive aspect of that Sacrifice which had disappeared from sight, even if their eucharistic theology be impugned as wholly inadequate, it cannot be maintained that they intended to discontinue the ministry which Christ ordained, or to cease to transmit all the powers that He intended should belong to that ministry.

May I take this opportunity of replying briefly to Dr. Messenger's criticisms of my article, dealing with the points he has expressly mentioned ?

1. He states that " there is no reason to suppose Bucer objected " to the formula *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* as used at the Imposition of Hands. It remains true that this formula does not occur in Bucer's rite as found in *De Ordinatione legitima.* If this work was written (as Dr. Messenger holds) before 1550, then the Anglican Revisers deliberately rejected Bucer's vague formula in favour of the traditional one; if (as Dr. Firminger holds) it was written after 1550, the compilers of the second Ordinal refused to accept Bucer's emendation of the 1550 formula. Probably the Reformers believed (incorrectly, but in accordance with an opinion common at the time) that the words " Receive the Holy Ghost " were an essential part of the Form of Ordination.

2. The sentence he quotes from Gairdner's *Lollardy* (ii., p. 317, not p. 377, as he states) occurs in the same paragraph as the sentence quoted by myself. It is hardly a fair expression of Gairdner's view to construe the sentence, " How the Ten Articles for English use were elaborated out of the sixteen articles of Wittenberg we cannot trace in detail," into the assertion, " Gairdner says expressly that the Ten Articles were elaborated out of the Wittenberg Articles," without making clear that Gairdner also says that the Ten Articles " differed altogether from the German set, though retaining a good deal of the same phraseology." Dr. Messenger's statement does not suggest that the dependence of the Ten Articles on Wittenberg is merely one of phraseology.

3. What Dr. Cross and myself were concerned to assert is that Dr. Messenger's exclamation that the rubric in the Communion of the Sick (1549) implies " that there is ultimately no difference between ' sacramental ' and ' spiritual ' communion !" must apply no less to the rubric of the Sarum Manual quoted by us on which the 1549 rubric is based. Dr. Messenger evades this point.

4. No one could seriously fail to admit the close relation between the Anglican rite of Ordination and Bucer's draft; and as far as I know no Anglican writer fails to admit it. The question as to whether Bucer's draft was written before or after 1550 remains at present an open question. Authorities like Dr. Firminger are not so easily disposed of as Dr. Messenger seems to think.

5. Admissions that I have made (which again few Anglican apologists will be concerned to deny) concerning the erroneous eucharistic views of

Cranmer and others, as also the ambiguity of language which characterizes the Anglican rite no less than more primitive rites, do not, as I have maintained, affect the intention of the Reformers to carry out our Lord's purpose in instituting the Sacrament.

6. I am certainly prepared to reaffirm both statements which Dr. Messenger notes at this point. I do not believe that any New Testament scholar today, whose opinions on this point are worthy of consideration, can be quoted in defence of the position that the Apostles thought of themselves as primarily and essentially sacrificing priests, or in defence of the *dictum* of Trent that the Lord constituted the Apostles priests by the words " Do this in remembrance of Me." Dr. Messenger no doubt knows more than I do about the definition of the priesthood which would or would not be acceptable to a " Free Church " minister; but I must confess myself baffled by the subtlety of his allusion to the " American Ordinal."

7. Dr. Messenger defends the inaccurate sentence, " The Catholic Church never makes use of the term ' exhibited,' " on the grounds that he was referring merely to the statements of the Council of Trent. I accept his explanation of the sentence; but his slipshod use of tenses had deceived me. If he was merely referring to the Council, it would surely have been more natural to say, " The Church nowhere made use of the term." Nor does this explanation account for the unholy glee on which he fastens on any use of the term " exhibit " in reforming documents, wherever it occurs, without giving his readers any hint that this term is in common use among Catholic exponents of the doctrine of the Real Presence. As regards his statement on the use of this term in the fourth of the Ten Articles, I cannot agree that " whatever this English article teaches, it does not teach transubstantiation." Constant's opinion that it is orthodox cannot be merely dismissed by the use of italics and an exclamation mark; and though certainly not expressing the doctrine of Transubstantiation in explicit terms, the article is quite compatible with that belief. But I am content to reply, " Whatever this English article does not teach, it does teach the Real Presence."

8. I thank Dr. Messenger for his explanation of the terms of official censorship, and repeat the last sentence of my article: " What a light it throws on the value of the *Nihil Obstat* of the Censor Deputatus !"

Yours, etc.,
HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

PUSEY HOUSE,
OXFORD.
*November* 20, 1936.

---

DEAR SIR,

Readers of THEOLOGY will welcome Fr. Henry St. John's clear exposition in your November issue of the Roman Catholic doctrine of intention in its bearing on the question of the validity of Anglican Orders. It is, I think, quite clear that it is one thing to hold that the private views of Reformers, such as Cranmer, did not affect the validity of ordinations performed by them according to the Ordinal which they found in use; and quite another to say the same of ordinations performed by them according to a new Ordinal of their own, which they can hardly be supposed to have substituted for the old one, thereby separating themselves from the main body of the Western Church, had not their intention in con-

ferring orders varied in some important respects from that to which the old Ordinal gave expression. At the same time, it does not follow that they intended to originate a new ministerial succession or to revive a ministry obsolete since Apostolic times. I do not doubt that they intended to carry on the historic ministry of the Church, while abandoning the emphasis which had come to be laid upon the sacrificial function as the essential feature of the priestly office.

I think also that Fr. St. John is right in drawing a distinction between the absence of explicit reference to the sacrificial character of the Christian priesthood in early liturgies, composed before the nature of the Eucharist had become matter of controversy and consequent definition, and the deliberate omission of such reference after it had come to be recognized as the authoritative doctrine of the Church that this was the essential feature of that ministry.

If, however, notwithstanding our acceptance of Fr. St. John's positions on these two points, we yet hold that the Reformers of the Church of England were justified in what I take to have been their view, that, despite their departure from the doctrine which they found established, they were continuing by means of an Ordinal embodying that departure the ministry which had been in the Church from the beginning, it must be because we hold it to have been legitimate in them to criticize the actual development of doctrine which had taken place in the Church and to express their conviction that Popes and Councils had erred in over-emphasizing certain aspects of the ministry. Again we must agree with Fr. St. John that a " fundamental question of the nature and authority of the Church itself " is involved.

I believe that what is at issue is in fact the question of the presence in the Church (whether as represented by the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra* or otherwise) of an infallible *magisterium* expressing itself in irreformable definitions of dogma. I am convinced that only if the reality of such a *magisterium* be denied can we defend either the continuity of the reformed with the mediæval Church of England, despite the former's deliberate rejection or relegation to the background of much which in the latter was regarded as of primary importance, or the new stress laid by " Catholic-minded " theologians in the later Church of England upon doctrines which her Reformers in the sixteenth century had deliberately (at the least) refused to emphasize. Not papal infallibility alone, but all infallibility of the kind above described, appears to me irreconcilable with the method which God, as a matter of fact, has been pleased to follow in His revelation of Himself to mankind. The tendency in the Churches of the Reformation was to seek in the text of Holy Scripture, though nowhere beside, an authority elsewhere recognized as also present in the decrees of Councils or of Popes; but the modern critical study of the Bible has undermined its claim to be considered as, in this " oracular " sense, the " word of God." The Roman Church has not stood alone in asserting an infallible *magisterium* ; but it alone has, as it seems to me, reasserted it by the Vatican definition of papal infallibility in a form which does not admit of its gradual abandonment, and thereby presents what is, humanly speaking, an insuperable obstacle to the reunion of Christendom and to the exercise therein by the human reason of its inalienable rights.

There is a story that Leo XIII., when told that some concessions as regards the claims of the Apostolic See might facilitate the reunion of the Anglican with the Roman Church, threw up his hands with the cry,

"Mais c'est une question du dogme!" True or not, the story illustrates the real difficulty offered by the nineteenth-century development of Roman theology to mutual understanding between Christians within and Christians without the Roman communion on other and even more important questions than that of Anglican Orders.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

WALNUT TREE HOUSE,
MARSTON,
OXFORD.
*November* 16, 1936.

---

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Fr. St. John shews that the question at issue between his communion and ours as to the validity of our ordinations is a question of dogma. With this point we may well agree, and add that all disputes about validity of ordinations, not only this particular one, are really disputes about dogma. If we were all agreed on the nature of ordination, and the powers conferred by it, there would be few, if any, disputes about it. If this truth were universally realized, we should understand one another better, and irritate one another less.

We may further agree that the discussion of Anglican Orders with Roman Catholics is unprofitable. If Rome were to accept the validity of our ordinations, reunion would be no nearer, because we are divided by dogmatic issues. If we were agreed in dogma, the dispute about ordinations could be easily settled.

But Fr. St. John's letter raises a further consideration. According to the Bishop of Lincoln, all parties in the sixteenth century had lost sight of the real meaning of sacrifice. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice commonly taught was quite different from what the New Testament writers or the early Fathers meant by sacrifice. Modern research has made it possible for us to understand what nobody in the sixteenth century could have understood, because of the limitations of the age.

One side said, "The Church teaches this doctrine, therefore it must be true." The other side said, "This doctrine is contrary to the teaching of Scripture, therefore it is incredible, whether the Church teaches it or not."

The English Church, as Fr. St. John admits, rejected, not any and every doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but the "developed" doctrine which was commonly taught at the time. The doctrine implied by the English Ordinal is not even a direct denial of the Tridentine dogma, which had not yet been defined. Was there, before Trent, any defined dogma which the English Church clearly rejected by the alterations in the rite? and was altering the rite so as to exclude the popular teaching of the period (which teaching even Rome does not maintain officially) equivalent to making an entirely new ministry?

We do not, of course, accept the Tridentine definition; the Anglican Communion would not consent to reunion with any Church on this basis, as recent negotiations have shewn. Even if that definition were the best the sixteenth century had produced (which I do not admit), modern research into the meaning of sacrifice, both in the Old and New Testaments,

would make it impossible for us to accept it; all sixteenth-century formulas were subject to the limitations of their age, the Decrees of Trent as well as the Thirty-nine Articles and the Confession of Augsburg, and for that reason, if for no other, we do not make them a basis for reunion.

But we find ourselves in complete agreement on this point with other Churches whose ordinations Rome recognizes. The Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches do not accept this "developed" doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, either in its popular mediæval or in its Tridentine form, any more than we do, or than our forefathers did. They do not interpret their formularies in the Tridentine sense; indeed, they repudiate the word "propitiatorium." Why, then, should Rome accept their ordinations, any more than ours? For they do not intend to make "sacrificing priests," in the sense commonly taught in the Roman Communion in 1549, any more than we do.

Therefore we can hardly accept Fr. St. John's contention that the reasons given in the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ for rejecting the validity of our ordinations are the real reasons. The real reason is, much more probably, that to recognize Anglican ordinations would, in the opinion of the Vatican, hinder the flow of converts, perhaps even start a current in the other direction! Rome has the right to decide what ordinations she will recognize; but we should have more respect for her honesty if she gave her real reason.

Your obedient servant,
C. B. Moss.

St. Boniface College,
Warminster.
*November* 16, 1936.

# REVIEWS

God in Patristic Thought. By G. L. Prestige, D.D. Heinemann. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Prestige has written a very valuable book, replete with a vast amount of patristic learning.

In his Introduction he explains how the books came into being. It fell to him to investigate nearly all the words of main importance dealing with the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation for the projected Lexicon of Patristic Greek to be published, as we hope, by the Oxford University Press, and in the course of his researches he accumulated a mass of material far greater than could be printed in the actual Lexicon. This origin gives its character to the book; it is a sort of Oxford Dictionary of the Greek words connected with these two subjects translated into their English equivalents, based on historical principles, with copious illustrations of the usage of the Greek Fathers, and explanatory letter-press. The several chapters are arranged under the main headings and a Table of Contents gives their subdivisions. At the end there is a general Index and an Index of Patristic References compiled by Dr. F. L. Cross, and it may be stated that Dr. Prestige has used the latest and most authoritative texts.

When there is so much that is valuable it may seem hypercritical to allude to gaps in the wide expanse of the author's reading, but Dr. Prestige may be glad to have his attention called to books that have apparently escaped his notice. Thus he writes of the *Didache* (p. 877) " whatever may be the precise date of that perplexing and disputed document," apparently in ignorance of Muilenberg's *Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Apostles*, which, accepting Harnack's date, *c.* 131, for the former, shews that the *Teaching* is dependent upon it and thus cannot have been composed much earlier than the middle of the second century. So Dr. Prestige speaks of " the fumbling theology " of Eusebius of Cæsarea as affording great encouragement to the Arians (p. 140), in ignorance, we should gather, of the *Athanasiana* of E. Schwartz, which seems to shew that Eusebius was condemned as an Arian by the Council of Antioch in the winter of 324, " until the great and hieratic synod " should meet in the following year. These are minute points, and do not affect the value of Dr. Prestige's work as a book of reference. And that is not its only merit. It is refreshing to be reminded that, besides being a Roman jurist, Tertullian was a theologian trained in the Greek tradition, and that the term " prosopon,"

in addition to meaning " a character in the cast of a play," has a long history in the Septuagint, which was probably far more influential in determining its usage in Greek theology; and in other points besides these he supplies a welcome corrective to views adopted without due investigation, which tend to become traditional.

There is, however, an almost accidental blemish which entails unnecessary vigilance on the part of the reader, and renders the book somewhat misleading to the theological apprentice. Why, in dealing with the doctrine of the Trinity, does Dr. Prestige translate his Greek term into " Person " instead of contenting himself with transliterating it into " hypostasis " or occasionally " prosopon " ? Using his own epigrammatic distinction, " hypostasis " stands for an object and " persona " for a subject (p. 235); why, then, does he suggest by his terminology that Greek theologians spoke of three " Subjects " in God, which of course they most certainly did not ? It is one of the merits of Greek theology not merely that God was for it a singular term, whence man and things could in contrast be classed together as " geneta," as Dr. Prestige points out, but that it did not and could not blur the vast distinction between God and man by using a term such as " person " applied, though in different senses, to both.

Dr. Prestige goes, as we have said, beyond the function of a mere recorder of other men's views by trying to render them intelligible to our own generation, and for the most part to our great advantage, but he does no true service to those who wish to familiarize themselves with modes of Greek theological thinking when he introduces not merely the Latin theological term " Person " but the far more modern term " personality." It is hardly fair to overpress Dr. Prestige's " hypostasis = object," and " persona = subject," but what could a Greek theologian make of " the personality of the Holy Spirit," that is " the subjectivity of the third Object " or " the hypostatisation of an hypostasis " ? This is by no means a merely verbal cavilling. Is not English thought, as regards the Divine Triad, so largely tritheistic owing to the use of the word " person " without the warning conveyed by inverted commas ? And is not the theological mistiness which Dr. Prestige deprecates, arising from a highly ambiguous terminology, at least partly responsible for the absence of any first-class English theological treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity from its metaphysical as distinct from its historical or psychological side, and for the infiltration of misleading theological ideas into public and private forms of worship ?

F. J. Badcock.

CHARLES LINDLEY, VISCOUNT HALIFAX. Part II.: 1885-1934. By J. G. Lockhart. Geoffrey Bles. 12s. 6d.

Mr. Lockhart has done the second part of his work uncommonly well. He has had a great subject, but it is plain that he himself is a biographer of parts. His volume contains a well-informed and vivid account of many public events and movements, and a fascinating picture of the man. He has had the audacity to include a number of those explosions of indignation which almost every enthusiast is unable now and then to restrain, but are all too seldom recorded in the Life. These, of course, are only occasional, and though violent enough ("Owls!" "Traitors!" "I could strangle him with my own hands!"), they have no touch of ill-will. To all, friends and opponents, he always bore himself with exquisite courtesy, which was but the fruit of a still more exquisite Christian charity. Mr. Lockhart's picture is that of a great Christian gentleman.

Religion was the ruling passion of his life. His zeal for orthodoxy, his efforts for Reunion, his controversies, all arose out of his absorbing devotion. Mass, Meditation, the Daily Offices were for him the first duties of the day, and planning and working for the Catholic cause occupied the greater part of the remainder. Yet he found time to be a lord of the manor, a sportsman, and the head of a family.

The practical results of his faith were mainly two. One was a continual battle for orthodoxy, in the course of which *Lux Mundi* was viewed through Liddon's distressed eyes, Bishop Gore was loved and disapproved of, and later Dr. Barnes was utterly condemned:

> "That Bishop has done every possible mischief he could do to the Church of England, and I am quite at a loss to understand how the rest of the episcopate have been able to put up with him as they have. He should have been treated by them as they treated Bishop Colenso."

The other was work for Reunion. This was almost wholly in the West. His old friends, W. J. Birkbeck and Mr. Athelstan Riley, prevented him from forgetting the Orthodox Church in Russia and the East. (Birkbeck once told him that a Russian Abbot had reported that "the English Orders were evidently valid; the only doubt that could be attached to them would be the fact that they were derived from the Roman Church after she had fallen into heresy, but that now that the English Church had thrown off most of the Latin heresies the English Orders are far more certainly valid than the Roman ones!") But his own thoughts turned always towards reunion with the apostolic See of Rome. Mr. Lockhart tells the story of the

early attempt (1890-1896), which was brought to nothing by the "enormities" of Cardinal Vaughan. And he tells, in much more detail and with admirable balance, the later story of Malines. In this it is manifest that the personal relationship of Cardinal Mercier and Lord Halifax was a wholly beautiful thing, and that Lord Halifax never quite saw, as some of his colleagues did and as his biographer does, that the Cardinal "never really understood the Church of England." Still the attempt was very gallant, and it did not fail nearly so completely as that of thirty years before.

Halifax, with his radiant optimism, hoped all things, and sometimes went near to believing all things. This led him now and then to go beyond his brief. Yet Mr. Lockhart, in a striking chapter, finds much to say of his *Pietas Anglicana*, a phrase often on the lips of Halifax himself. It was unshakable. He did not love the Church of England for its own sake, as many do, but he was wholly convinced of its adequacy. He "often represented the last reserve, called out when all else had failed, to keep some doubter in the Church of England." For himself there was never any hesitation. He writes to Father Knox in 1915:

> "Difficulties and troubles are no reason for abandoning a post. What would have happened to the Church if the Catholics had allowed themselves to be driven out by the Semi-Arians? They are only reasons for a greater constancy and a more determined resistance. 'J'y suis, j'y reste'—that ought to be the motto of every one of us. And for myself I can only say that every day, every year that passes only increases my absolute conviction of the truth of the position to be defended in the Ecclesia Anglicana, of the value of that position to the whole of Christendom, and of the honour and glory it is that God should have seen fit to call us—all unworthy as we are—to contend for the faith."

His Anglicanism was not of a universally acceptable pattern. He could never understand why everyone did not want to use the 1549 Liturgy. They always had it at Hickleton. No one had ever said a word against it there. Why not have it everywhere? He was innocently unaware of the strength of the Protestantism to which a return to 1549 would seem a retrograde, even a Popish, step. Moreover, he was utterly unworldly. He longed, really longed, to see a martyred Archbishop:

> "I cannot conceive anything more splendid than that your Grace should be executed on Tower Hill. Nothing but the Martyrdom of an Archbishop can save the Church of England. I crave the honour of it for you, and that I should live to be there, so that I might plunge my handkerchief in your blood, and pass it on to Edward as the most precious of heirlooms."

These things are not the marks of conventional Anglicanism. Yet in one matter he was in agreement with very nearly every churchwarden in the land, and with the writer of this notice; he did like the Mass to be said audibly.

Finally, the book reveals a tenderly affectionate family life. It would be unseemly to attempt to appraise this. Those who wish to know what it was must refer to the book. But if we pass for a moment beyond the family circle, there are letters to Queen Alexandra and to his servant, James, which are worthy, though he was in these matters humility itself, and would always disclaim the idea of being anyone's spiritual adviser, to stand with the letters of a Fénelon or a Bishop Edward King. Lord Halifax's life was a wonderful affirmation of the truth that goodness is irresistibly lovable, and that single-mindedness is more effective than great gifts.

S. C. Carpenter.

---

The Roman Primacy to A.D. 461. By B. J. Kidd, D.D., Warden of Keble. S.P.C.K. 5s.

The word "Primacy" is an elusive one. In itself it has only a relative meaning, and in the course of its history it has had successively several different parts to play, which easily become confused. It is one of the advantages of Dr. Kidd's admirably concise, documented, and authoritative book that he distinguishes where others confuse; and traces out the growth of the claims that gradually arose round its ecclesiastical use in the three and a half centuries which lie between the epochs of Clement in the first century and Leo in the fifth. The primacy of the Church that is in Rome comes first; then the primacy of the episcopate, rather than of any particular see or sees; then the primacy of the great churches and bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome. A parallel line of advance is shewn by the Roman use of the Petrine text (Matt. xvi. 18, 19). It is not used in the first stage at all. The Roman primacy is rested upon other bases—its apostolic foundation by the two apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul; its own moral ascendancy; its reputation for orthodoxy, and the like; apart from its conspicuous position at the focus of the Roman Empire. In the second stage the text is much used. In St. Cyprian's view *Tu es Petrus* is the charter of the episcopal authority. So it came about that the partnership of St. Peter and St. Paul in the primacy of the Roman Church was dissolved; St. Paul was eliminated and St. Peter remained sole. But the *cathedra Petri* has in his view a primacy which is shared by all other catholic bishops.

Now if this was the view of Africa it was natural that in Rome the text should be caught up and utilized in a different sense, in favour of a primacy which belonged to Rome and which the other catholic bishops did not share. The militant Pope Stephen seems first to have utilized it to justify himself in making a unique claim to the *cathedra Petri*.

A fresh function of the Roman primacy in the West was recognized, at the Council of Arles in 314, to be that of being intermediary in chief within the West, or between West and East; and to the latter the Nicene 6th Canon refers. But greater accretions to the profit of "primacy" follow. The Council of Sardica in 343 drew up rules for the revision of ecclesiastical cases concerning bishops, and assigned to the Pope his responsibility in various contingencies, for seeing that justice was done. Subsequently the Emperor took up the matter; and his decision ascribed more to Pope Damasus than the Church had done, placing metropolitans subject to him throughout the West, and enlarging his appellate powers over ordinary bishops. This was all very well for the West, though the source of the authority was secular. When Damasus found himself mixed up in Eastern quarrels, the Emperor was ready to let Rome stand as a test of catholicity; but the Church there through its councils was less complacent, and primacy looked small. In Rome this made the need and the opportunity for a Council to be held there, charged to define and advance further the development of the primacy. Dr. Kidd rightly takes the groundwork of the so-called "Gelasian Decree" to be the work of Damasus and this Roman Council of 382. In the second place of its business this Council, having settled the List of Canonical Books, went on to a definition of the primal position of the Roman Church, taking care to base it not on the decision of Synods, but on the *Tu es Petrus*; and to put down the order of the great sees as being each dependent upon this Petrine authority—Rome first, Alexandria second, Antioch third. On this shewing the primacy of Rome is the one original, all others are derivative.

Three hundred years have brought great changes in claim and outlook; and yet there is more to come. We must not in this review follow Dr. Kidd step by step any further. Suffice it to say, that in the spirit already described, and with the fine scholarship and fairness which he had so far maintained, he continues his enquiry for three substantial further chapters, dealing successively with "Rome and Africa" in the first half of the fifth century; "The Council of Ephesus," 431, etc.; and "St. Leo the Great," including the Council of Chalcedon, 451. At that point the terse survey ends, with a recognition

from Dr. Kidd that the Petrine theory was now finally put into shape by St. Leo; but also with a caution that in one respect it is now usually modified. For the Pope is not now generally taken to be the necessary channel of all episcopal authority. That is bestowed on the bishop by our Lord Himself. But it is not exercisable apart from the Pope. Well, well! Two final pages are devoted to a summary of criticism on the Petrine theory, as it is set forth, on St. Leo's lines, by the Vatican Council; and the reader is brought up-to-date. In this small volume a great deal is lucidly compressed and expounded. The author must be both thanked and congratulated.

✠ WALTER FRERE.

---

ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF THE YORK SCHOOL OF GLASS-PAINTING. By John A. Knowles. S.P.C.K. 30s.

This is an important and stimulating book. Its scope is, to some extent, indicated by its title; that is to say, it is not a guide to the ancient stained glass in the cathedral and parish churches of York. It serves rather to answer the questions that naturally arise in the mind of anyone who intelligently examines the windows. Who gave them and why? Where and by whom were they painted? What is the most popular subject-matter; why was it chosen and how far does it show the spirit of the times in which the windows were painted? Full and clear answers are given to these and many other questions.

The glass was almost all painted by York men. A notable exception is the great east window of the Minster, painted by John Thornton at the beginning of the fifteenth century. A chapter is devoted to Thornton, and another to the Black Death that was probably the cause of his coming. The York glass-painters nearly all belonged to certain families, especially in the later years. Many of them lived and worked in the parish of St. Helen's, Stonegate. They worked in harmony, with little or no competition, apprenticing their sons to each other's firms and doing their best to keep the craft within the bounds of their own circle.

York was, to some extent, shut away by itself, and so the glass-painters developed their own particular characteristics, and hung on to old methods and styles long after more progressive centres, such as London, had abandoned them. Yet it could not be wholly independent, and a considerable portion of the book is given over to describing the various influences that came to develop and modify the York glass-painting. Thus there are chapters discussing the changes due to the impact of the severe Cistercian ideals, of the glass-painters of other

English centres, especially at Oxford and Wells, and of foreign ideas and happenings.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is that devoted to the subject-matter and the donors of the windows. There is no doubt that the Minster is remarkable for the worldly and secular character of all its work. The glass, as the author remarks, has " very little religious feeling about it." Some of it conveys a sense of cheapness and mass-production, particularly that less easily seen. The feeling is not so strong in the parish churches, and the glass in them is, on the average, of better quality. This is partly due to the fact that the citizens of York did not love the cathedral authorities, and preferred to lavish their money on the parish churches, leaving the ecclesiastics and the county families to do what they could for the many windows of the Minster. Very interesting are the chapters dealing with the favourite subjects and the political allusions in the windows. Two subjects, the representations of " Corpus Christi " and the " Coronation of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Holy Trinity," are dealt with at length. The political allusions are many and various, and show how the donors of the windows trimmed their sails in the stormy times of the fifteenth century.

Most practical reasons are given for the erection of many of the windows. Some were advertisements to attract pilgrims and the money in their pockets; others were put up to make straight the paths of preferment. One occasionally wonders whether there is not too eager a desire to " debunk " the windows, and, in attempting rightly to clear away unhistorical romancings, to strip all concerned—whether donors, glass-painters or worshippers—of any spiritual motives whatever. One feels inclined sometimes to cry with Abraham " Peradventure ten righteous shall be found there ?"

The book is not only valuable to those interested in the history of glass-painting. The writer of economic history will find invaluable material for the study of an important mediæval gild in prosperity and in decline, of the sources and cost of mediæval glass, and of such-like matters. The glass itself often affords an amazing amount of information about the period in which it was painted, about people of all classes, the town in which they lived, their joys and troubles, their diseases, their clothes, their processions and penances. The St. William window in the Minster, painted about 1421 and showing the highest standard of York glass-painting, contains a mass of such detail. It shews, too, how little this source of information has been tapped by students of mediæval life in its various aspects.

There is a wealth of illustrations—sixty-three plates and

seventy-nine figures in the text—the great majority of them based upon the author's own photographs and drawings. The plates illustrate not only the glass, but also analogous works, such as embroidery, statues, processional crosses and prints. Illustrations of the district where the glass-painters lived, their church, the font in which some of them were baptized (this is a particularly beautiful plate), and the modern tablet to their memory form a fitting conclusion to the series.

The book is singularly free from misprints. We notice "stil" for "still" on page 171. Mr. Sidney Pitcher, to whom we owe so great a debt for his beautiful photographs of glass all over the country, has for some while been a Fellow of the Royal Society of Photographers (plate ii.).

The publishers are to be warmly commended for their enterprise in producing, in so inviting and acceptable a form, a work of real scholarship and permanent value.

CHRISTOPHER WOODFORDE.

## NOTICES

THE DIVINE GARDENER. By the Right Rev. Arthur Karney, D.D., Bishop of Southampton. Mowbrays. 1s. 6d.

Here are seven addresses given to clergy in retreat. The Bishop of Southampton uses a common framework for them all: Christ before the eyes, Christ in the heart, Christ in the hands. First there is a meditation on some quality shewn by our Lord; then a prayer that He will implant this quality in our hearts, and so enable us to carry it in our hands to the world. The Bishop lays his finger on the weak spots in the ordinary Christian life. He insists on the fundamental things, penitence, humility, patience, gentleness, and complete surrender, without which all our bustle and organization is of small avail. Many, laity as well as clergy, who are bewildered and depressed by modern life will find in these simple words a source of renewed faith and love.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

SERMONS FOR THE CORONATION. By various preachers. Skeffington and Son, Ltd. 3s. 6d.

These seven sermons provide, when taken together, all the information which a preacher is likely to require when framing his own coronation addresses, besides suggesting reflections on kingship, empire, service, and kindred topics. Not everyone would be suitable for reading as it stands; some are rather long for that. But each is useful in its own way, as a mine from which thoughts and extracts may be procured. The best is Dr. Alington's—short, clear, well illustrated, and with just the right emotional tone throughout. His use of the poem "When wilt thou save the people?" is a happy touch. G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

THINGS YOU CAN SAY TO THE SICK. By the Rev. Norman R. Campbell, B.A. Skeffington and Son, Ltd. 2s. 6d.

Visiting the sick is at once a difficult and an easy task, as every priest knows. It is difficult, because the sight of suffering calls up in the visitor the pain of compassion. It is easy, because in the sick room, of all places, the priest cannot fail to be aware of the work he has to do; and he receives again and again proof that his simple words and acts have brought relief, often to the body as well as the soul. But the work requires abundance of delicacy and tact. No two cases are alike, and for that reason books and fixed forms must be used with care. Mr. Norman Campbell would not claim that his Talks are more than suggestions; indeed, his wise advice that the sick person should be encouraged to talk himself and to express his thoughts would forbid long addresses. The Talks are, however, useful and to the point. They revolve around Bible stories, which are made to convey appropriate lessons. Simple prayers are also given.

Whether it is wise to assert that all sickness such as cannot readily be accounted for is due to the operations of the devil is doubtful. The element of risk unavoidable in a world designed to be a home for free beings will account for much; and the devil may be no more at work than he is when a parent allows his child to climb a tree. Many clergy today make prayers for healing a principal part of their sick visiting. This book, while not entirely omitting such prayers, does not give them prominence.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

---

THE LIVING FOUNTAIN. By Karl Heim. Translated by J. Schmidt. T. and T. Clark. 5s.

Volumes of sermons have little appeal nowadays. All the more reason, then, that a collection like the present—by the Professor of Theology at Tübingen—should not be overlooked. Unafraid to face the disquieting problems of today, Karl Heim is quietly confident that there *is* a solution for them—namely, the practice of the presence of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. It may be said that there is little that is new in these Sermons, but there is a great deal that is eternally true. Simple, direct, evangelical, they ought to waken the consciences and touch the hearts of many. We may add that the reader will find the translation of these Sermons, by an American pastor, pleasant to follow.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

---

WITHIN THAT CITY. By Arnold Lunn. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

There is a tale told of a certain revivalist, who, having noticed, while he was addressing the audience, that a certain young man in the front row seemed much impressed with his remarks, came down from the platform and asked: "Are you saved?" "Oh no," the young man answered ingenuously. "*I'm the Press.*"

It sometimes happens, however, that "the Press" is saved; and, as a natural consequence, uses religious experience and conviction as "copy." Hence such books as *For Sinners Only*, and the volume now before us. To class these works as journalism is not to say that they are in any way insincere. It is merely to avoid comparing them with, for example,

St. Augustine's *Confessions* or Newman's *Apologia*, and to condemn them because they are not something which they never set out to be.

This title, however, *Within that City*, is misleading, for it suggests that Mr. Lunn will unveil to us Roman truths and Roman beauties which can only be discerned by converts. He does, indeed, say a number of wise and thoughtful and interesting things, but, except for the very striking quotations, they are almost all concerned with Mr. Lunn's reactions to Rome and not with Rome herself. In the same way many devotional and mystical books present to us, not the supreme object of devotion, but the writer's feelings as he approaches it. The value of *Within that City* is, therefore, psychological. It shews an emotional man's conversion to beliefs with which we are familiar, and his subsequent eagerness to prove how reasonable they are. *For Sinners Only* has touched the hearts of many people who would never have looked at St. Augustine, and Arnold Lunn will doubtless strike home where Newman's delicate instrument would break. I do not wish to be flippant, but may I pass on to him a feather for one of his arrows, a new argument for Papal claims. "Croyez donc au Pape!" cried a warm-hearted Frenchwoman, flinging her arms round my neck. "*Il est si gentil!*"

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

---

AND I WILL GIVE HIM THE MORNING STAR. By Hugh A. Studdert Kennedy. Putnam. 6s.

The Church has always been suspicious of mystics, and rightly so. For when a mystic uses his gift of insight into Reality to nourish his pride, he becomes a danger to himself and to others. He boastfully cries, "I see!" and gathers round him a following of persons too eager and too credulous to ask whether the seer is, or is not, competent to interpret his vision. The savage who "saw" a fiery dragon running away with a village had caught a first glimpse of the express train as it dashed past him in the night, but he was not a safe guide for potential passengers, though he became an object of wonder for other savages who had missed the sight.

If this review should fall under the eyes of Mr. Hugh Studdert Kennedy, he will probably be much surprised that anyone should think him proud. But he has set out to give us a new religion, a new interpretation of the word "God," and a new revelation of His purpose for man. Turn to pages 56 and 57. After having set all the theologians right on the subject of the nature of the Deity, he proceeds to enquire how the Anglican Church definition of God "measures up to the one *that I have evolved without the aid of Church or creed*?"

The italics are mine, and might be followed by some such exclamation as ——!!! Unfortunately, however, it is quite possible to identify both the Church and the creed which provided Mr. Studdert Kennedy with the final *réchauffé* of ancient heresies. He is, consciously or unconsciously, a disciple of that well-meaning but muddle-headed lady, Mary Baker G. Eddy. Alas! that the vision granted to him in childhood, which might have led him along the road that Treherne trod, should have landed him in the sticky morass where quite nice people believe that matter, sin, sickness, and death do not exist, and that the world is the Kingdom of Heaven because Mrs. Eddy says so.

Why the author should claim that he takes Jesus (who was not "the

Christ" or the Son of God, as St. John the Baptist and St. Peter were foolish enough to believe) for his guide is entirely incomprehensible. Jesus never asserted that God was Mind and Principle, that sin is unreal and repentance unnecessary.

I have, however, finally succeeded in tracing another influence in this book besides that of Mrs. Eddy—the influence of the caterpillar in *Alice*, who had the remarkable power of making words mean what he liked. Which may possibly explain Mr. Studdert Kennedy's habit of using passages of Scripture to prove exactly what they do not say.

He will not, of course, object to what I have written. How can he? An unfavourable review, an unkind critic, what are they? Errors of mortal mind. According to the insight of Mr. Kennedy, neither of them exist.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

---

SUPPLEMENT TO PEAKE'S COMMENTARY. Edited by A. J. Grieve, D.D. Jack. 2s.

As one who was closely associated with the rival Commentary (Bishop Gore's) I may be allowed to welcome this Supplement to "Peake," which is a quite indispensable summary of the progress of scholarship between 1919 and 1936. It will be every bit as useful as a supplement to "Gore." Gore had the advantage of appearing nine years later than Peake, an advantage which was perhaps not fully used. It served a purpose which had been left unfulfilled by Peake, of introducing the rank and file of thoughtful Anglicans to the conclusions of Biblical scholarship. So great was Bishop Gore's prestige that they would accept his word that certain adjustments had to be made, whereas Professor Peake had left them unmoved. Gore kept always in view the theological issues, and therefore had a greater influence on the general public. Some of the contributions, such as those of Edwyn Bevan, H. St. J. Thackeray, and C. H. Turner, were of supreme excellence, partly because they were allowed to exceed the limits which should strictly have been insisted upon. And the inclusion of the Apocrypha in Gore gave a balance and completeness that was lacking in Peake. But there were fewer weak spots in Peake, which in many ways is the better book.

No Anglicans write in the Supplement; this, however, is irrelevant, for in every sentence one breathes the air of scientific exactness and aloofness from controversy. The writers all have a marvellous power of skilful compression.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

---

*Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher*